DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 361 UD 035 140

AUTHOR	Iversen, Roberta Rehner
TITLE	Moving Up Is a Steep Climb: Parents' Work and Children's Welfare in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative.
INSTITUTION	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	72p.; Some shaded charts may not reproduce well.
AVAILABLE FROM	Annie E. Casey Foundation, 701 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, MD 21202. Tel: 410-547-6600; Fax: 410-547-6624; Web site: http://www.aecf.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Welfare; Children; *Employed Parents; Employment Opportunities; Family Income; *Family Work Relationship; Inner City; Job Skills; Job Training; Low Income Groups; Poverty; Promotion (Occupational)

ABSTRACT

This monograph presents findings from ethnographic research about parents' work and children's welfare in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Job Initiative. The Initiative was designed to improve the futures of poor, inner city people who were disadvantaged in their previous work efforts because of inadequate education, immigrant/refugee status, incarceration, racism, substance abuse, or inappropriate work experience. The Initiative provided support and assistance to community based organizations and other groups helping low-income workers secure living-wage jobs with benefits and advancement opportunities. Study data came from discussions with and observations of over 400 people associated with 10 Job Initiative families. Chapter 1 presents key lessons about the Initiative. Chapter 2 uses excerpts from Initiative participants to illustrate how work and family intersect for good and ill, elaborating challenges economically disadvantaged families face trying to reach family-supporting incomes, strategies used to keep and advance in jobs, and how these challenges and strategies have an impact on children. Chapters 3 and 4 present conclusions and implications for public policy. Overall, the Initiative resulted in good jobs with higher wages, benefits, and advancement, though reaching that goal was a long process. Four appendices highlight research design, sample description, job initiative site comparison, and job and wage progression charts. (Contains 99 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 361

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

Moving Up is a Steep Climb

Parents' Work and Children's Welfare in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative

Roberta Rehner Iversen

April 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W.J. Rust
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

UD 035 140

Copyright © 2002

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of United Parcel Service, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and neighborhoods fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs. For more information, visit www.aecf.org

Author: Roberta Iversen

Production Managers: The Hatcher Group
Design & Layout: NITETRAIN Studios
Printing: Pavsner Press, Inc.

Moving Up is a Steep Climb

Parents' Work and Children's Welfare in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative

Roberta Rehner Iversen

April 2002

Participants

Randy Jackson

Mike Jeremy

Tasha Jones

Kevin McDonalds

Lucky Miracle

Teresa Russell

Tisha Shanks

Isabell Smith

Maya Vanderhand

Hard Working Blessed

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Annie E. Casey Foundation generously funded this independent research project. I bear full responsibility for the interpretations, conclusions, and errors.

Many dedicated people contributed to this ethnography. I am particularly indebted to Susan Gewirtz, Assistant Project Director of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's *Jobs Initiative*, for her vision that led to the ethnographic project and generous encouragement throughout; and to Robert Giloth, Annie E. Casey Foundation's *Jobs Initiative* Project Director who joined Susan to expand the project's scope. Milwaukee Jobs Initiative site directors, Laura Dresser and Caroline Schultz, and Seattle Jobs Initiative site director, Dianne Hanna, generously opened their doors and administrative data to the research team, as did the sites' staff members, trainers, and community affiliates. Abt Associates, Inc. and New School University, the national evaluators, also shared data and knowledge. Julie Strawn, senior policy analyst, and Mark Greenberg and Steve Savner, senior staff attorneys at the Center for Law and Social Policy provided valuable comments on the policy implications section and Ed Hatcher of The Hatcher Group provided valuable editorial suggestions on early drafts.

Three exceptionally skilled researchers conducted much of the on-site research: Annie Laurie Armstrong, M.P.A. in Seattle, and Diane Michalski Turner, Ph.D. and Kathe Johnson in Milwaukee. The quality of the data set is due in great measure to their expertise and persistence.

Two University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work doctoral research assistants, Mona Basta and Michele Belliveau deserve similar credit for thorough background and literature searches, data analysis, and construction of early drafts of the family stories. Their excellent work contributed significantly to the rigor and rich detail in this monograph.

Also at Penn, Ira M. Schwartz, former Dean, and Richard J. Gelles, Interim Dean of the School of Social Work gave valuable structural support for this research. Christine Holmes completed exceptionally accurate transcription of the audiotaped interviews and Barbara Boyd-Williams gave administrative assistance. Kathryn Edin has been my referral angel and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. my sustaining mentor.

My husband, Gudmund R. Iversen, provided the expressive support that enabled this research project to flourish.

Above all, I am indebted to the five Milwaukee and five Seattle families who shared their lives openly and generously with the research team. [All names are pseudonyms chosen by the family]
In Milwaukee: the Hard Working Blessed family; the Randy Jackson family; the Tasha Jones family; the Kevin McDonalds family; and the Tisha Shanks family.
In Seattle: the Mike Jeremy family; the Lucky Miracle family; the Teresa Russell family; the Isabell Smith family; and the Maya Vanderhand family.

These families' impressive strengths and continuing needs demand our close and immediate attention.

Roberta Rehner Iversen, Ph.D.
University of Pennsylvania
School of Social Work
riversen@ssw.upenn.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Summary of Ethnographic Findings	4
Chapter 1: Lessons about Parents' Work and Children's Welfare from the Jobs Initiative Ethnography	10
Chapter 2: Challenges and Strategies for Retention and Advancement from the Jobs Initiative Ethnography	17
Challenge #1: Trying to Make Enough Money	17
Challenge #2: Trying to Stay Employed (Retention)	26
Challenge #3: Trying to Move Forward (Advancement)	38
Chapter 3: Conclusions	45
Chapter 4: Implications for Public Policy	46
Appendix A: Research Design	51
Appendix B: Sample Description	55
Appendix C: Jobs Initiative Site Comparison	57
Appendix D: Job and Wage Progression Charts	60
References	65

INTRODUCTION

Despite the robust economy in the 1990s, by 2001 one in six children under age six in America still lived in poverty (National Center for Children's Poverty, 2001). Distressing increases in poverty were experienced by families with *two* working parents (City Kids Count 2000, 2001). Worse yet, economic recession and the aftermath of September 11th's tragic terrorism led to increased layoffs and unemployment among parents in the low-wage labor market.

At the same time, two public policy changes have radically affected how poor parents get, keep and advance in jobs. First, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) replaced the 60-year old Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program with the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. TANF limits receipt of public assistance to a lifetime maximum of 5 years and also requires that recipients engage quickly in work. Hence, programs under TANF, generally described as "rapid attachment" or "work first," allow minimal to no pre-employment education or training. Second, the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) replaced the Jobs Partnership Training Act (JTPA), the nation's main workforce development policy since 1982. WIA ushers in a new, local "one-stop" approach to the delivery of post-employment education and training services. Because of cuts in funding and a broadening of the target population beyond those JTPA defined as "economically disadvantaged," local WIA boards are able to award more training dollars to dislocated and incumbent workers than to low-income or unemployed workers.

Both policy changes were spurred by reports that human capital and skill training programs did not lead to sustained employment among those most disadvantaged (Friedlander & Burtless, 1995). Launch of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative in 1995, an 8-year, 6-city workforce demonstration program targeting poor, inner-city men and women, was also spurred by those reports—but in the opposite direction.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative. The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative (JI) was designed to improve the futures of poor, inner-city men and women who were disadvantaged in their previous work efforts by inadequate education, immigrant or refugee status, incarceration, racism, substance abuse, or work experience that did not utilize their competencies or potential: in short, the unemployed and under-employed. These men's and women's neighborhoods yielded few jobs, their service supports were distant and inadequate, and their education and training providers were fragmented and under-funded. In response, the Jobs Initiative oriented its efforts to change in *both* individuals and systems. The Initiative provides support and assistance to community-based organizations (CBOs), city agencies, local foundations, and other groups that help low-income workers secure living-wage jobs with benefits and advancement opportunities (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2000). Workers are generally considered "low income" when their income is below 200% of the federal poverty line (Greenberg, 2001). The long-term goal of the Jobs Initiative is to generate reforms of public and private jobs-related services and systems that impact local labor markets more broadly (Abt Associates and New School University, 2000). At base, the Jobs Initiative aims to improve children's welfare by increasing their parents' earning power and mobility.

By design, the Foundation invested in a wide variety of Jobs Initiative projects across the sites. A few followed a "work first" model, emphasizing job access with post-employment follow-up. Most countered the rapid attachment trend by investing in customized hard and soft skill training, curricular and job placement partnerships with employers in promising industry sectors, and collaboration between regional education and human service institutions. The Jobs Initiative is guided by the premise that skill training, increased language competency, institutional and organizational collaboration, and post-employment services *together* can provide real opportunity for poor

urban residents. Recent reports that education-focused versus rapid attachment welfare-to-work programs result in longer work periods and higher earnings (Freedman et al., 2000; Hamilton et al., 2001) reinforce the Initiative's emphasis on education *and* employment.

The Jobs Initiative's clear goals of "good jobs"—jobs with good wages, benefits, retention, and career mobility—set it apart from earlier job training programs (Gewirtz, 2001; Giloth & Phillips, 2000; Giloth & Gewirtz, 1999; Harrison & Weiss, 1998). The Jobs Initiative required starting wages of $7/hour or higher [in 1995 dollars]. In fact, the average placement wage was $9.13/hour (Fleischer, 2001). The Jobs Initiative's implementation methods set it further apart. A regional intermediary in each city channeled Foundation funding and technical assistance to its network of local partners and held them accountable for placement and retention targets. Projects developed and refined customized skill training curricula with continuous input from area employers and industry representatives. Community-based organizations, educational institutions, and employers developed service delivery partnerships to "cover the bases" of JI participants' needs. Sites also pursued changes in city and state policies through advocacy and formal relationships with legislators and government representatives.

National evaluation of the Jobs Initiative produced rich information about participant characteristics, site activities, and outcomes during the start-up and capacity building phases (Abt Associates & New School University, 2000; Fleischer, 2001; see also www.aecf.org/jobsinitiative). Briefly, by December 2000 almost 12,000 poor inner-city residents had enrolled in the Jobs Initiative as a whole. Per program design, Jobs Initiative participants were severely economically disadvantaged. One-third had less than a high school diploma. Close to 20% spoke languages other than English as their primary language. Just less than half (45%) received public assistance and almost two-thirds (59%) had annual incomes of less than $9000 (Fleischer, 2001:7). Over 5500 male and female Jobs Initiative participants were placed in jobs with significantly higher wages and benefits than their previous jobs offered. Importantly, most of these jobs were full time, full year. A variety of program supports complemented pre-employment skill training or direct job placement to help workers stay employed and move toward family-sustaining wages. Of those not placed in jobs, some dropped out of the Initiative before placement, others have not yet reached the starting wage requirement and are thus not counted as official placements, and a sizable number is still in training.

Two major questions emerged from the evaluation data that the Annie E. Casey Foundation chose to pursue through ethnographic research at Jobs Initiative sites in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (MJI) and Seattle, Washington (SJI). These questions are conceptually based on examining how human, social, and cultural capital affect families trying to "move up." Human capital is viewed here as pre- and post-employment education and training; social capital as the trusted and reciprocal relationships between individuals, organizations, institutions, policies, practices, and supports; and cultural capital as developmental enrichment and resources that families provide for children.

Question #1: **How does Jobs Initiative training and employment affect the participants, their families, and their communities?**

Question #2: **In particular, how does a parent's participation in the Jobs Initiative affect his or her children's welfare?**

The Jobs Initiative through an Ethnographic "Lens." A key challenge for public policy has been the scarcity of rigorous research into the diversity of paths to workforce success among low-income parents (Strawn & Martinson, 2000:10). Large-scale evaluations have yielded valuable information about *what* effects different programs had on

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

women's welfare receipt and work entry (Hamilton et al., 2001), but they have not told us *how* poor workers—men and women—move up in the labor market (Nightingale & Mikelson, 2000). Rigorous national surveys have documented that poverty is associated with poor child outcomes, but they have not told us *why* and *how* poverty or parents' work affects children's development (Corcoran, 2000). In response, this research uses ethnography to illuminate "*how*" and *why*" poor parents' work affects children's welfare.

As we know, people's lives do not come in discrete "bits." Lives evolve dynamically over time in conjunction with other people, events and conditions, and in specific geographic locations. Because ethnography is a research method that studies people's lives intensively, over time, and in their natural contexts, it can reveal "inside" information about how and why work and family life intersect, capturing the impact of unsettling transitions as well as more stable periods. Ethnography also invites multiple perspectives on the lives and situations being examined, thus assuring a "rounded" as well as inside view.

In short—ethnography can show us the "whole family" in its "whole context" over time, not just its parent, child, or employer at a single time point. In this study, parents' and children's strengths and needs are elaborated through the observations, descriptions, points of view, and beliefs of Jobs Initiative participants and other people and systems important to their work and families. We spent several days a month with parents and their children, extended families and neighbors, experiencing first-hand the struggles and resilience in their day-to-day work and family lives. We accompanied parents on 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. and other work shifts and talked with their co-workers, managers, and supervisors. We spent many days in children's childcare facilities and elementary, middle, and high schools, following the youths to classes and talking with their teachers, administrators, and peers. We spent other days in churches, therapeutic settings, and community enrichment facilities. Finally, we spent many days with Jobs Initiative intermediary staff, project staff, and community partners learning in detail about their curricula and support services and about how the new workforce systems functioned under the Jobs Initiative.

Essentially, we talked with and observed enough people (over 400) who were associated with ten Jobs Initiative families in Milwaukee and Seattle over a long enough time (18 months in 2000-2001) to learn valuable new information about how parents' work and children's welfare intersect [See Appendix A for site descriptions and details of the research design]. As a result, ethnography's special "lens" reveals here *how* parents' work affects parents and children, *how* children's needs affect parents' work, and *how* other relevant people, organizations, and policies affect parents' work and family worlds.

Summary of Findings from the Jobs Initiative Ethnography

How did the families fare *before* the Jobs Initiative? Some of the men and women who headed the families in our study had made mistakes as youth or young adults—serious mistakes that resulted in years of incarceration or residential treatment. Despite having "paid-in-full," the family heads struggled unsuccessfully in the labor market, unable to obtain jobs that would last or provide future possibility. Other family heads fled besieged home countries and sought political asylum in the United States, leaving valuable credentials, identities and family members behind in Africa, Asia or Central America. They had also struggled unsuccessfully to forge work futures in a land with foreign language and institutions. Still other family heads were too young, too old, or perhaps too dark-colored to access their American dreams.

These family heads struggled for five to twenty years before Jobs Initiative enrollment with reliance on public assistance, crushing debt, chronic health problems, periods of depression, legal problems, racism, jobs that paid minimum wage and did not offer benefits, jobs that only lasted a few months, jobs that did not use their education or skills, and not enough education to find a better job. The families had also struggled, with varying degrees of success, to provide for their infant, preschool, and school-age children. Some children did well in school even though schools and student progress were limited by inadequate resources. Other children had struggled with chronic health problems and developmental deficits, unsafe neighborhoods where dodging bullets and drugs was common, too little space in their homes, not enough food, foster care or guardianship, periods of separation from their parents, erratic medical care, and poorly-funded schools. The study parents' non-resident children received less contact and financial support during their parents' hard times as well.

How did the families fare *after* the Jobs Initiative? The Jobs Initiative launched men and women into "good jobs" that gave them new options, directions and financial stability. Their children benefited accordingly. Yet a "steep climb" remains. For most, reaching a family wage takes much longer than anyone originally estimated. Earlier research identified that many welfare-receiving parents needed to take small, incremental steps over a period of two to five years to reach sustained attachment to jobs and approach adequate incomes (Herr & Halpern, 1994). This research found that *it takes three years or more for parents with any employment challenge in their background to approach financial security through work*. Children need a similarly long time to overcome family separation, poor school starts, and financial insecurity

We learned that parents' work impacts their parenting through income, benefits, safety, stress, resilience and time. We learned that making enough money means increasing one's wages and skills and that these goals take time away from children. We learned that some employers enact "family-friendly" policies and practices that facilitate meeting children's needs and that other worksite conditions make meeting children's needs more difficult. We learned that some public policies help families make ends meet, allowing children to be fed and clothed, and others are unknown or withdrawn too quickly. We also learned that crushing debt, family separation, refugee experiences, and not enough education slow or derail wage progress. Children then reflect these negative influences in their school behavior and performance. We learned that some urban schools punish children for their parents' long work hours and others provide rich resources despite inadequate funding and teacher burnout. We learned that supportive relationships mediate many of these stresses over time, but not all of them. And we learned that as families gain income and stability, they become more involved in their communities.

Key Lessons and Remaining Challenges from the Jobs Initiative Ethnography

- The Jobs Initiative resulted in "good jobs" with higher wages, health and other non-wage benefits, and advancement possibilities for poor inner-city men and women who had been disadvantaged in previous work efforts.

- Education and skill training definitely mattered to getting and keeping a "good job." Human capital development "launched" even economically disadvantaged individuals into good jobs. Jobs Initiative "legitimization," as a form of social capital, also contributed.

- "Good jobs" mattered directly and indirectly to the children of Jobs Initiative parents, at times dramatically. Gains in children's grades and behavior, neighborhood safety, therapeutic resources, and family climate were generally sustained, despite sometimes-precipitous ups and downs in parents' employment.

- Getting a "good job" also increased families' connections and participation in their communities. Children's connections increased alongside their parents'. Good jobs also increased parents' interaction with their children's schools.

- At the same time, regardless of what kind of labor market disadvantage parents suffered before Jobs Initiative enrollment—be it welfare receipt, immigrant or political refugee status, former incarceration, former substance abuse, depression, racism, or not enough education—reaching a family-supporting income was many years away. Even after three or more years of steady, hard work, Jobs Initiative parents did not earn family-supporting incomes.

- Notably, we discovered a "*life-stage mismatch*" between Jobs Initiative workers and their employers. A *"life-stage mismatch"* was characterized by wages, policies, practices, and conditions in the workplace that did not match the worker's age, family status, physical condition, and persistent life challenges. Children's well-being often mirrored this mismatch.

- Jobs Initiative parents engaged in many strategies to meet the challenges of staying employed, making more money, and moving up. Working overtime or taking a second job produced more family income but often diverted parents from meeting children's developmental needs. Subsidies, income supplements, and community resources were helpful but not sufficient to assure families' financial stability. Importantly, supportive relationships were often needed for two years or more—far longer than they are generally available in workforce programs. Children's well-being often paralleled the receipt or absence of public and program supports.

- The difficulty of getting more education and skills remains the steepest barrier to achieving a family-sustaining income. Pursuit of college education or apprenticeship training was generally halted by untenable opportunity costs for Jobs Initiative workers who had children to raise and were saddled with debt and other life burdens.

- Multiple efforts are necessary to help economically disadvantaged parents move up: effort by the worker; effort by the workforce program; effort by the employer; and effort by those making public policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Utility of the Findings. In addition to 'fleshing out' findings from national surveys and evaluations, this research extends knowledge gained from earlier ethnographic or qualitative analyses of women receiving or leaving welfare or men and women in low-wage work (Dodson, 1999; Edin & Lein, 1997; Newman, 1999; Shirk, Bennett, & Aber, 1999) by its inclusive focus on how workers' lives, workforce development systems, employers, and public policy intersect to affect parents' work and children's welfare. In particular, this study amplifies how workforce development—specifically, education, skill training and post-employment support—contributes to the job mobility of low-income workers, and how that mobility or its absence affects the workers' children.

The family stories in this monograph are representative of the life situations of many of the 2300 Jobs Initiative participants and their families in Milwaukee and Seattle. Because of the rigorous design, study findings may be transferable to countless other struggling, low-income working families in America as well. The experiences of Jobs Initiative participants may also represent the next steps facing welfare-leavers in their work and family worlds.

As national attention turns from reducing welfare caseloads to helping low-income workers keep and advance in jobs, lessons from the Jobs Initiative may be increasingly salient. The depth and extent of information about parents' work and children's welfare from the Jobs Initiative ethnography can contribute to decisions about how to allocate workforce development and welfare dollars so that low-income earners keep jobs and advance to family-supporting incomes. This research also reveals how workforce programs, employers, and public policymakers can help low-wage workers move up the job ladder in ways that improve rather than hinder children's immediate and longer-term well-being.

Organization of the Monograph. This monograph presents findings from ethnographic research about parents' work and children's welfare in the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative. Chapter 1 amplifies key lessons about the Jobs Initiative. Chapter 2 uses excerpts from Initiative participants, partners, children, trainers, employers and others, selected from the complete family narratives, to illustrate how work and family intersect—for good and ill. The chapter elaborates challenges that economically disadvantaged families face trying to reach family-supporting incomes, strategies they employ to keep and advance in jobs, and how these challenges and strategies impact children. Chapter 3 presents conclusions from the Jobs Initiative ethnography, and implications for public policy follow in Chapter 4. Details of the research design, the sample, the Jobs Initiative sites, and the workers' job and wage progression over time appear in Appendices A through D. Ten family stories constructed from the study data are available through the Annie E. Casey Jobs Initiative web site at www.aecf.org/jobsinitiative.

CHAPTER 1

LESSONS ABOUT PARENTS' WORK AND CHILDREN'S WELFARE FROM THE JOBS INITIATIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

"Good Jobs" through the Jobs Initiative Resulted in Better Wages and Benefits and Some Asset Accumulation

The Jobs Initiative launched parents into "good" jobs—jobs with wages and benefits far surpassing what they ever achieved before Jobs Initiative enrollment. Nine of the 10 family heads in our study got jobs through the Jobs Initiative; the tenth had not yet been placed and remained employed at his pre-JI worksite.

Before they enrolled in the Jobs Initiative, study participants' wages averaged $8.07/hour in Milwaukee and $7.75/hour in Seattle, similar to the average $8.07 pre-enrollment wage across the six Jobs Initiative sites (Abt Associates and New School University, 2000). While these wages may seem relatively adequate, they generally came from jobs that were part time and part year. In contrast, Jobs Initiative placements were full time and full year, producing increases in the family heads' annual incomes of $3,350 to $19,800 relative to their *potential* full-time annual incomes from previous jobs or public assistance [See Appendix D for job and wage progression data]. These increases are dramatically larger than those reported in reviews of earlier job training programs (Bartik, 2001) and had equally dramatic impacts on the families' children. Although subsequent wage progression was far more limited than these initial "jumps," as discussed in Chapter 2, because Jobs Initiative intermediaries were regionally located and involved, they were able to influence wage progression at some employers. JI project-employer partnerships were particularly well situated to impact employers' wage practices. For example, Milwaukee Jobs Initiative's printing project persuaded companies to increase their starting wages by 50-cents to $1.50/hour.

In addition to good wages, a core expectation of the Jobs Initiative was that employer partners would provide employee benefits, even though this expectation ran counter to the national decline in benefit provision over the past decade (Nafziger, 2000). In contrast, the family heads' pre-JI jobs had seldom offered health or other non-wage benefits.

All the Jobs Initiative placements offered health and other benefits, either immediately or after a 90-day probation period. It must be added however, that while family heads generally utilized employer benefits for themselves, most kept their children on Medicaid as premiums were exponentially more expensive when they covered partners or children. As Gerstel and Clawson's (2001) research underscored, affordability is key to taking advantage of benefits that are offered. Jobs Initiative workers did not use employer health benefits, even if that meant they were left uncovered, when their contribution to the premium went beyond about $15/month. On the other hand, as parents' wages increased, several moved their children off Medicaid to their employer's health policy. Partners and spouses were variably covered by their own employment or by extended Medicaid where available, as in Wisconsin.

Better wages and benefits also allowed the Jobs Initiative workers to begin to build savings and assets. Indirectly, employer benefits helped Jobs Initiative parents think more expansively about their children's futures. For example, when one family head changed jobs, tuition reimbursement benefits and inexpensive life insurance led her to think long-range for the first time about new options for the college futures of her middle-school children. More directly,

Jobs Initiative wages allowed four families to buy cars, albeit old ones, and five to begin or expand savings accounts. Three families moved to upgraded rental housing or safer neighborhoods and four started thinking seriously about purchasing homes. While savings and housing plans were frequently interrupted by more immediate needs, seeds for future mobility were sown.

Jobs Initiative Skill Training Mattered to Getting a "Good Job"

The amount and quality of the skill training that participants received through the Jobs Initiative directly influenced getting and keeping a "good job," although to different degrees as the family stories document. Essentially, human capital development mattered. Customized training in manufacturing, automotive services, office occupations, printing and construction was preceded or augmented by instruction in soft skills, Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL), and GED [See Appendix A].

Important to the aims of the Jobs Initiative, even when skills learned in training were not used directly on the JI job, workers drew on them in later employment or pursuit of new career directions. Even the family head that did not get a new job through the Initiative felt that aspects of his training contributed to a later job change.

Jobs Initiative training also acted as a platform upon which the new workers built additional skills at the workplace. Skill accrual led to promotion opportunities—although not always to initial acceptances—or to subsequent jobs that offered broader responsibility and higher wages. Jobs Initiative workers taught their new competencies to co-workers, raising the overall skill level at the worksite.

Jobs Initiative skill training also mattered indirectly through increasing worker confidence. The new workers felt proud of their new abilities and more hopeful about the future. At the same time, all felt strongly that they needed more training to move further forward; particularly more computer training. Their views coincide with the fact that most of the employment gains among workers over age 25 during the 1990s were for those with at least some college experience. Employment declined for workers with a high school diploma or less (Martel & Langdon, 2001). Immigrant parents wished for longer and more intensive ESL and GED training, having been hindered by the lack of academic certification in earlier work efforts [The role of post-employment education and training is discussed more fully in Chapter 2].

Jobs Initiative "Legitimization" Mattered to Getting a "Good Job"

Access to a good job that the individual could not have gotten otherwise was a similarly important benefit of Jobs Initiative training. The Jobs Initiative conferred "legitimacy" on the trainees' efforts that served as important social capital in the labor market. Jobs that were "guaranteed" up front, in conjunction with JI training, illustrated the most powerful aspect of the Jobs Initiative legitimization function, one that developed out of the Initiative's focus on systemic partnerships between programs, trainers, education institutions, and employers. The more intimately the employer felt connected to Jobs Initiative staff, and the longer the Initiative-employer relationship, the more positive the employer felt about the new worker. Although employers said that the new workers' "skills" influenced their hiring decisions, it seemed that the Initiative's sanction was equally influential. Employers' comments about workers' skills were always followed by effusive comments about their relationships with Jobs Initiative projects and staff.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Jobs Initiative legitimization was particularly critical for participants who had been in prison, as job prospects of former felons have long been poor (Western, 2001). The study's formerly-incarcerated family heads were among the nearly 500,000 prisoners released each year (Marshall, 2001) who had experienced employer rejections due to their patchwork post-prison work histories or in stereotypical response to their history of incarceration. Equally important, Jobs Initiative legitimization withstood job changes. Subsequent employers prioritized work experience gained in the initial JI job over concern about the worker's former incarceration. The Jobs Initiative's legitimization role for former felons is particularly critical now that the imprisonment rate for African Americans and Hispanics is over 8 times and 3 times higher respectively than the rate for European Americans (Oliver, 2001) and 83.7% of all JI participants are African American or Hispanic (Abt Associates and New School University, 2000).

Jobs Initiative legitimization also bridged educational deficits in accessing good jobs—either lack of a high school diploma or GED or the inability of immigrants and political refugees to gain recognition for education that took place in their native countries, significant education in several cases. Notably, in contrast to the experiences of former felons, the legitimacy conferred on individuals with educational deficits was not portable. Individuals without a recognized diploma or GED were relegated to staying in exploitive non-JI jobs, remaining in jobs with little wage progress, or passing up promotion opportunities potentially achievable through changing jobs.

Supportive Program Relationships Mattered to Getting and Keeping "Good Jobs"

When most of us reflect on our challenges and successes, we can identify a person who helped us move forward. The Jobs Initiative workers were no different. Regardless of whether the Initiative project offered formal or informal "case management," new workers in both cities emphasized that having a staff "person" who helped with their struggles often made the difference between staying at or leaving a job, particularly during tumultuous life or work periods.

The Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) designed two years of formal case management support. Although Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) projects did not initially include formal case management, staff increasingly found themselves filling this role, often over similarly-extended periods of time. In contrast, the most extensive TANF programs provide 90 days of follow-up for new workers, far too little according to earlier research (Herr & Halpern, 1994), recent analyses (Strawn & Martinson, 2000), and the ethnographic findings.

Despite studies that showed mixed results about the influence of case management on retention (Rangarajan & Novak, 1999), this research found that training, a supportive relationship, and workplace practices were inextricably connected with retention. None was sufficient on its own, but this 'package' of supports helped Jobs Initiative workers move ahead in their jobs and lives. Ethnography further illustrated that many families need long-term program support—beyond two years in many cases—to compensate for multiple intersecting challenges to staying employed. Such challenges include holdovers from the past such as debt and language problems, family crises such as partner's unemployment and children's health problems, workplace injuries and racism, and public policy inadequacies such as precipitous subsidy withdrawal. Consumed by the challenges of a new job, family heads were not initially able to locate alternative resources to help them stay employed or advance. Over time, families learned new ways to locate resources. Thus, even in the Jobs Initiative, where new workers were *thought* to have fewer challenges than those who had been on welfare for many years, their challenges persisted well beyond getting a job and required sustained support.

Program-worker relationships supported children and communities as well. Families creatively and assertively used Jobs Initiative support to find or expand after-school activities for their children, guide selection of their children's schools, and provide volunteer opportunities for family members. These relationships also fostered community engagement; because of their Jobs Initiative involvement, the parents all wanted to "give something back" to others.

Program supports or case managers could not overcome "family-*un*friendly" workplace and policy factors (discussed in Chapter 2) that influenced job decisions; nor should they. But when employer practices and policies were family-oriented and subsidies and supplements were in place, case managers provided essential "bridge" funds, encouragement, post-employment advice, re-employment help, service referral, and other such supports that markedly contributed to the new workers' abilities to manage work and family demands and move forward.

"Good Jobs" through the Jobs Initiative Mattered to Children's Welfare

The Annie E. Casey Foundation was vitally interested in how the Jobs Initiative affected children's welfare because most recent research about children and poverty has been conducted among welfare recipients (Zaslow, McGroder, & Moore, 2000) and not among other low-wage workers, such as those participating in the Jobs Initiative. Ethnography revealed that children generally fared well under their parents' involvement with the Jobs Initiative, according to common indicators of child well-being such as health, home behavior, school performance and behavior, peer interactions, community involvement, and housing, despite backgrounds of poverty and family disruption.

Children's substance use or sexual activity was not reported or detected. All wore seatbelts or had safety seats, although one family used them irregularly. All homes had smoke detectors. All children had well-child and preventive medical care, except during parents' job-transition periods. None was diagnosed with a learning disability, although one was suspected and another was eligible for an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) for special education. Most were involved, to varying extents, in after-school sports or cultural activities. None was in trouble with the law, although several had occasional suspensions from school. Several held part-time jobs, and most participated to some extent in a church or family religious activity.

Good jobs also gave parents more—although still not enough—time and money to address challenges to children's welfare that stemmed from prior economic disadvantage. These challenges included chronic health problems, periods of separation, new family formations, geographic moves, inadequate childcare, grade retention, and below-average grades. Reversing these problems often took *two years or more*, a period that was frequently lengthened by the paucity of help from healthcare systems and under-resourced, beleaguered inner-city schools. Nevertheless, the Jobs Initiative at least launched parents and children on a compensatory path.

The Jobs Initiative mattered to children of parents who were formerly incarcerated or in residential treatment. Perhaps the most impressive benefits of Jobs Initiative training and employment for children occurred among parents who had been incarcerated or whose children were previously in foster care. These parents began to compensate for years in prison or treatment centers, completely cut off from their families, by becoming the main income provider through legal and respected means. The regularity of new work hours, income, and benefits let parents take part in children's school conferences, attend to their developmental and medical needs, help them with homework, and read them stories at bedtime; in other words, be a full-fledged parent. Time to undo the ravages of the past was limited, but parents sacrificed sleep, negotiated compatible work hours, and sometimes even passed up advancement to meet their children's needs.

Some of the children's lives improved almost miraculously from their parents' Jobs Initiative involvement. Teen children of a former felon and his new wife were able to leave dangerous Chicago neighborhoods, poor schools, and the custody of less capable parents to live with their other parent and blended family in safer Milwaukee communities with better schools. These teens' grades eventually improved as a result, although that took two years. Other teens, some of the seven million children of parents in prison or on parole, slowly overcame the terrors of police involvement in their mother's life through the stability and security of her JI manufacturing career. Given the much higher rates of delinquency among children whose parent or close relative was in prison (Marshall, 2001), the Jobs Initiative helped these parents counter that outcome so far. In another case, a pre-school child in Seattle was retrieved from foster care and his mother was able to fully support him for the first time in his three years of life. After intensive developmental therapeutic services and a home life stabilized by his mother's employment, the former foster child and his younger brother, who spent his early years recovering from fetal drug damage, graduated to regular school.

The Jobs Initiative mattered to children of young and single parents. In cases where "parenting" had been constrained by below-poverty incomes, inconsistent job histories, and insufficient skills, the Jobs Initiative increased young and single parents' economic stability, which resulted in positive byproducts for their children. For example, a young parent in Milwaukee was able to move to her own apartment with her children, furthering the development of the family as an independent unit. Although the pride she felt initially from her Jobs Initiative training and job accomplishments was eroded by transportation problems, exhaustion, and the fact that her children needed continual medical care, she was able to keep her apartment by changing jobs with the help of a Jobs Initiative post-employment counselor. Purchase of toddler-proof safety appliances and more time to read to the children accompanied her job change. Another single parent's Jobs Initiative training and employment and intensive, sustained case management allowed her to adequately feed and clothe her fast-growing pre-adolescent son, expand his after-school and summer enrichment resources, and generally provide structure and stability in a household that had previously been unstructured and financially unstable. These parents were also able to begin to build cultural capital for their children in the form of greater knowledge about the world of work, occasional travel, more resources, and more understanding about the process of "career development."

The Jobs Initiative mattered to children of immigrant parents. Immigrant parents and their children had somewhat more complicated experiences in the Jobs Initiative. One parent gained ten hours a week through Jobs Initiative employment to spend with his pre-school and elementary-age children, earning more money and working fewer hours. He used some of the extra hours to participate in his African tribal group where his children gained cultural and social enrichment. Another parent who emigrated from a Central American country in her youth had not completed high school, yet Jobs Initiative training and employer connections leapfrogged her into a high-paying clerical position that enabled the family to move to a safer neighborhood with better schools. The children suffered lower grades in the short term because they were educationally behind from their previous schools, but greater school resources and higher student performance figures promised longer-term advantage. Other immigrants/refugees were somewhat less successful in Jobs Initiative employment, seemingly more hindered by language difficulty, lack of understanding about American social institutions, and uneven project implementation (Iversen, 2000). Two immigrant family heads were stuck in jobs with no advancement or with injurious work conditions. Their solutions were to take a second job or make a downgrade job change. Their children did not get the pre-school enrollment or at-home enrichment they needed to draw equal to more economically-advantaged peers, although more parent time and extended family supports ameliorated some of this lack.

***How* the Jobs Initiative Mattered to Children.** Some research recently explored connections between welfare-to-work programs and children's behavior (Morris et al, 2001; Hamilton, Freedman & McGroder, 2000). Suggestive connections were found between certain program characteristics and children's welfare that varied according to the children's ages. For example, Morris and colleagues (2001) found decreased school achievement and increased behavior problems among adolescent, but not elementary-age, children of women leaving welfare for work. However, these researchers generally found it hard to identify particular "causes" of children's behavior. Moreover, these studies did not examine how parents' workplace characteristics and life situations might influence children's lives independent of the type of program the parent attended.

This research found that decreased school achievement and increased problem behavior among children occurred *across age and grade*. Children's problems were associated with a highly complex intersection of simultaneous factors: parents' jobs that were physically strenuous, unsafe, and exhausting, leaving little energy for children's development; insufficient wages that necessitated extensive overtime, which left little or no time to oversee children's school work; prior separation from parents that manifested in children as social withdrawal or acting out; transfer to more rigorous schools that demanded more parent-school consultation; and children's worries about parents' health that manifested in preoccupation and poor grades. Essentially and not surprisingly, the more challenges that parents experienced in their work and home lives, the more academic and behavior problems their children exhibited at school. This pattern occurred across the children in a family, regardless of their age, rather than only among some age groups and not others.

These findings raise questions for further research: Are the effects of parents' work on children embedded in the cumulative influences of the family situation across age or grade levels, as we found, or are they age- or grade-specific, as other research suggests. This research suggests that age is just one of many factors influencing children's resilience or struggle when they live in families who have persistent challenges and inadequate incomes, even many years after the parents have gotten "good jobs."

It must also be noted that in both cities, most children of JI parents attended schools that were below average, compared to other city schools, on fundamental academic dimensions such as reading, writing, and math. Whether and how workforce programs like the Jobs Initiative can counter such pervasive and incremental disadvantage to children's educational welfare will be addressed in a future publication (Iversen & Armstrong, in progress).

The Jobs Initiative Increased Community Connections

The Jobs Initiative designers were also interested in whether attaining "good jobs" allowed workers more time and energy for community participation, and whether success in the labor force led to a greater sense of being part of the larger community. At first contact, we found it surprising that most of the families were relatively isolated from extended family and neighbors. There were a number of reasons for this isolation. They lived long distances from extended family, particularly if they were immigrants. They mistrusted the 'world at large' and tended to focus inward on their nuclear family group. They concertedly avoided family members who had been abusive in earlier years. Extended family members themselves were struggling to make ends meet. In partial compensation, the Jobs Initiative shored up the families' formal community supports via case management and referral to the Initiatives' human service partners. About two-thirds of the families were also involved to some extent with religious organizations that provided another source of support as well as an outlet for their service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Over time, as the Jobs Initiative workers sustained longer periods of employment and growing wages, they ventured out into their neighborhoods and communities. Children's worlds expanded alongside parents' worlds. One Jobs Initiative worker gradually began to trust people in her new neighborhood so that she allowed her 4 children out to play. The children then made new friends, reducing the isolation they had suffered under, and found valuable computer and tutorial resources for their school assignments from a willing neighbor mentor. Other parents had new opportunities to practice and model civic responsibility through voting and involvement in community mediation and advocacy activities. Their children then participated in school and civic rallies against race discrimination. Another JI worker had new time and energy to develop an ethnic dance group that included his children. Subsequent recitals culturally enriched his children's school community. Finally, several Jobs Initiative workers gave motivational speeches at Jobs Initiative training orientations or classes and others wanted to do so.

Jobs Initiative parents also sustained a higher level of participation in their children's schools than they had been able to do before the Initiative. They regularly went to parent-teacher conferences at schools where barely 10% of parents attended, they chaperoned field trips, and they facilitated children's charitable school activities, such as singing at nursing homes. They also actively consulted with teachers and administrators to maximize school quality for children transitioning to a new grade level and responded more readily to school summonses for conferences to improve children's performance, although not without major costs in lost wages and sleep.

Jobs Initiative workers did not utilize community stores or banks more frequently than they had before enrollment, largely because of perpetually tight budgets. Nearby stores were either too expensive or unavailable, which meant that parents still needed to spend hours of precious time seeking economies and bargains. One family's children had to walk half a mile past boarded-up buildings to find a store that sold soda. Immigrant families patronized local ethnic facilities but also traveled to distant neighborhoods for sales. Parks and community centers were used fairly liberally in Seattle with its "outdoor" ethos and legislative support, but were generally underutilized in Milwaukee where they were also less easily accessed.

CHAPTER 2

REMAINING CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES FOR RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT FROM THE JOBS INITIATIVE ETHNOGRAPHY

The premise underlying the Jobs Initiative was that it would provide skill training and access to jobs with family-wage potential. The new workers would then be able to get upgrade education and training, accept advancement opportunities, and progress to economic self-sufficiency. Ethnography illuminated the complexity of this premise. Despite the sometimes exceptional and almost always significant "plusses" of Jobs Initiative training and employment, many factors caused strain for parents and problems for children, even as the family also experienced better times. Importantly, these factors were generally beyond what individual families or even path-breaking workforce programs like the Jobs Initiative could counteract on their own, drawing our attention to the role and responsibility of employers and public policymakers in making work pay. The remainder of this monograph uses excerpts[1] from the "family stories[2]" to illustrate how the following challenges to "moving up" influenced both the workers and their children, and what strategies families used to try to overcome the challenges:

Challenge #1: Trying to make enough money
Challenge #2: Trying to stay employed (Retention)
Challenge #3: Trying to move forward (Advancement)

Challenge #1. Trying to Make Enough Money

Having gotten a "good job" through the Jobs Initiative—importantly, one that was full time, full year—families thought their struggles might be over. The parents rapidly discovered that being able to support one's family on earnings requires more than a good job. Most could not build steady savings and assets, purchase homes, move to safer parts of the city, or afford enriching resources and experiences for their children like home computers and summer travel. Families often had trouble paying rent, affording quality childcare, and some ran out of food by the end of the month.

Many factors limited families' efforts to make more money...

Wages and incomes were dramatically higher than before the Jobs Initiative, but they were still not fully adequate for the families' needs. Wage progression was variable. Two incomes were necessary, but seldom consistent. Income was reduced by debt, unpaid workdays, and a *"life-stage mismatch."*

Initial wages were good; annual incomes were even better—but neither was sufficient

The study workers' base wages after Jobs Initiative training and placement far surpassed their wages from pre-JI jobs. In both cities, family heads' base wages increased 27% on average: from $8.07 to $11/hour in Milwaukee and from $7.75 to $10.68/hour in Seattle. Because most pre-Initiative jobs were not full time or full year, changes in annual incomes through Jobs Initiative employment even more dramatically illustrate the increases possible in moving from welfare, poor employment, or under-employment to "good jobs." Milwaukee family heads' annual incomes increased from 117% to 160%; Seattle's from 144% to 380% [the latter was from TANF to a full-time "good job"].

[1] The brief family stories in Chapter 2 were excerpted from the full stories to highlight a particular challenge or strategy. The complete family stories illustrate the larger context of multiple, overlapping challenges in which the families were embedded.

[2] All family members' names are pseudonyms chosen by the family.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Despite these increases, the family heads' lived experience of not enough income was corroborated by comparing their incomes to the federal poverty guideline (FPL). After 1½ to 3 years of work, annual incomes of the Milwaukee workers averaged $32,550 *when overtime was counted*, resulting in 195% federal poverty level. Without adding income from overtime, which was frequently irregular, MJI workers' wages averaged $28,074 or 156% FPL. Similarly, after 1½ to 2½ years of work, SJI family heads' annual incomes averaged $24,668 or 150% FPL [See Appendix D]. It also must be emphasized that these figures represent *potential annual incomes*, not necessarily actual incomes. Some family heads changed jobs or got raises too recently to have the full income yet, and others would lose or leave their jobs before the income was realized.

Wages increased at varied rates and paces

"Good job" wages increased at varied rates and paces after the initial hire, even in union jobs with mandated, regularly-scheduled increases, as a Jobs Initiative retention analysis reported as well (St. George et al., 2001) [See Appendix D]. At some employers, wage increases were given annually, straining family budgets in the interim. At others, irregular wage increases meant that the workers' incomes were strained further, especially when the increase came after 18 rather than 12 months' employment.

After placement, the wages of the Jobs Initiative workers increased $1/hour per year on average [based on full-time work and adjusted for length of time employed], the equivalent of an additional $2000 in annual income per year. While this seems notable, and tallies with the Initiative's aim of wage advancement, the range was large: from a low of minus-$.70/hour per year due to a job change and demotion, to a high of $4.70/hour per year that is misleadingly high because it compensated for an earlier omission in the union raise scale.

In percentage terms, Jobs Initiative workers who remained in their initial JI-jobs averaged an 8% annual increase—notable compared to related research that reported an average increase of 1% among lowest-income families and 2% among middle-income families during the 1990s, but virtually half the 15% increase experienced by high-income families in that research (Simpson & Kaminski, 2001). The benefits of an 8% increase were also diluted when the raise was given at 18 rather than at 12 months. Among those who changed jobs, only one realized a sizeable increase of 12% from the move. Other job changes were essentially lateral, producing from 0% to 3% wage increases (the anomalous 22% increase due to a worker's taking a second full-time job was omitted from these calculations). The average increases underscore the importance of the starting wage, as did other Jobs Initiative analyses (Abt Associates and New School University, 2000). This research suggests that starting wage *and* the rate and pace of wage increase are both critical to reaching a family-supporting income level.

Given that these advances resulted from "good jobs," it was striking and discouraging that workers who had been employed for up to 3 years were still not able to command wages that made ends meet. It is also problematic that job change resulted more often in stasis or income reduction than in "moving up." Further complicating the assessment of wage sufficiency, individual wage figures mean little without also considering size of family, extent of needs, and ability of the wage-earners' partners, if any, to augment family income. Annual income figures mean little without considering how long the job lasted or is likely to be held.

Two incomes were necessary—but inconsistent

If and when they were employed, the Jobs Initiative workers' partners' or spouses' wages raised family incomes above 200% of the poverty line. In reality, similar to other families in low-wage employment, partners and spouses were frequently laid off or unemployed, making the JI family head's income critically important. In other cases, truly "single" parents or partnered sole wage-earners had no second adult wage and thus remained persistently below 200% of the poverty line. Two incomes were obviously necessary to make ends meet according to either the FPL or Self-Sufficiency Standard (Wider Opportunities for Women, 2001), yet the second worker's income could not be counted upon to do this.

Incomes were often reduced by unpaid work days and debt

Unpaid workdays and persistent debt significantly reduced how much money was really coming in or available to the families. Jobs Initiative participants took time off work to tend to their own or their children's health and school needs, to go to court, to relieve depression and stress, and to resolve childcare and transportation problems. On the plus side, some "family-friendly" employers understood their workers' needs and allowed them time off. On the minus side, some employers did not allow time off for family needs. In addition, even "family-friendly" employers did not pay for time off and most did not offer options to make up missed time for pay. *Missed work resulted in as much as $3000 to $4000 less annual income.*

Debts that carried over from the pre-Jobs Initiative period or emerged after JI employment also magnified the inadequacy of the family income. *These debts ranged from $5000 to $20,000*—a crushing and persistent burden on everyone in the family, as Kevin McDonalds's experience typifies.

***Kevin McDonalds's* Story:** After 2 years of employment in the printing industry, 29-year old, African American Kevin McDonalds was about two-thirds of the way to making enough income to support his family of three children: one in pre-school and two in elementary school. After six months at an initial, "guaranteed" placement, his Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) project referred him to a new employer that offered more advancement opportunity and subsidized upgrade training. Kevin was promoted once at the new job, enrolled in upgrade training two days a week after 3rd shift, and worked diligently to parent the children he had been separated from during his pre-MJI incarceration. Many days he worked his 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. shift, went to an upgrade training class, and then to a children's school conference without sleep. Still, he was grateful for his MJI opportunity:

> *"For a convicted felon, it was hard to find a job. MJI made it easier. In my new position as jogger, I'm motivated at work."*
> Kevin McDonalds

For a time Kevin took on a second job for more discretionary income and to try to save money, but gave it up when his children's school behavior and grades worsened in parallel with his unavailability. His first-grader was retained in grade and his younger daughter's promotion was threatened. Kevin's extra work hours reminded these young children of the painful earlier years of separation, and they expressed their distress in the only way they knew—by misbehaving so that the school would demand more time and involvement from the parents. Savings plans went on hold.

At our last meeting with Kevin in May 2001, he was nearly despondent about a punishing tax debt that he just learned about:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"There I am, doing the right thing, and whoa! Here I am, trying to get it right and I'm in another hole that I've got to fill up."

Kevin McDonalds

Eight years earlier Kevin had filed income taxes incorrectly and was only recently informed that he owed the IRS $9,000. Kevin's wages were now garnisheed, leaving15% less income to provide for his family. Compounding this income loss, future overtime hours would be reduced because of an industry downturn.

In addition, because Kevin's income still looked high "on paper" and debt is not a criterion in subsidy eligibility, Kevin and his fiancée were threatened with withdrawal of the valuable childcare subsidy that enabled their 3-year old son "Fireman" to attend a quality, licensed facility where he received developmental instruction and an eye exam that revealed he needed glasses.

A "*life-stage mismatch*" between workers and jobs limited families' efforts to make more money

Earlier research documented a "spatial mismatch" between inner-city workers' homes, distant urban jobs, and few or costly transportation links (Jargowsky, 1997; Wilson, 1987; 1996).

Ethnography revealed a new kind of mismatch—in essence, a "*life-stage mismatch*" between workers and jobs that severely limited families' efforts to make enough money.

The age, physical condition, health challenges, marital status, and family size of Jobs Initiative participants, like those in most other workforce programs, was very different from the youth, fitness, and single status of "traditional" entry level workers. *Life-stage mismatches* resulted in physical injuries, unpaid sick days, slowed performance, and stress. In addition, many Jobs Initiative placements were with employers where the length of industry career ladders, the pace of wage increase, and entry-level wages were set according to one—at most two—persons in a family, not families of four or five who came to their jobs with burdens of debt, prior distress, low self-confidence, and some kind of family disruption, internally or with social institutions, that they were trying to overcome—simultaneously. Hard Working Blessed's experience was one of many such *life-stage mismatches.*

***Hard Working Blessed's* Story:** Hard Working Blessed came to the Jobs Initiative in 1998 at age 38, an African American man recently out of prison. Earlier in his life, Mr. Blessed completed high school and attended two years of college in Chicago, married and fathered 4 children, and experimented with drugs. He held a series of construction, manufacturing and truck-driving jobs during these years, but none offered career development or advancement. Mr. Blessed's graduation into drug selling led to the end of his first marriage, alienation from his children, and eventual imprisonment in the state penitentiary on felony charges of controlled substances and drugs.

After release from prison and a period of residential rehabilitation, Mr. Blessed tried to turn his life around. Although he did all the "right" things to compensate for his past mistakes, the felony conviction blocked his progress in the labor market. In early 1998 a friend told him about a manufacturing position at Steel Company. At the time, Mr. Blessed was

stacking boxes at a Food Store for $6.50/hour. He went to the Steel Company Open House to apply for the position, but was frozen out because of his criminal background. At the Open House, Mr. Blessed fortuitously met the retention specialist from the Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) manufacturing project who told him about the Initiative. When Mr. Blessed was unable to get the Steel Company job on his own, he recontacted the retention specialist and enrolled in a 2-week project-sponsored training course that included essential hard and soft skills education for a manufacturing setting. Most important, Mr. Blessed was guaranteed a job at Steel Mill & Foundry when he finished the training class, illustrating how the Jobs Initiative provided the crucial entrée to those unable to attain positions without such legitimization.

During this period, Mr. Blessed met and married Mrs. Blessed who had just completed her own rehabilitation for drug use. Because of the income and benefits of the Jobs Initiative job, Mr. and Mrs. Blessed were able to bring two of their Chicago children to live with them and their new baby in Milwaukee. After years of separation, Mr. Blessed's top priority was "to be back in my kids' life."

"I was away for 5 years. I didn't see Tank [his 15-year old son] from the time he was 7 or 8 until he was about 13. After I got myself together—I went back to Chicago to see Tank. I met him outside the house. I said 'Are you Tank?' He said yes, 'who are you?' I said 'Your father.' He said, What's your name?' I told him—and asked if he wanted to see my ID. He started shaking and tears were rolling out his eyes. He hugged me and tears were coming out of my eyes too. We've been inseparable since that day. I thought my leaving would be better for the whole family. I shouldn't have cut the contact. Not a day went by that I didn't think about them, worry about them. It was goofy—I thought they'd be better off not knowing where I was, what was happening to me. But I know now that they'd have been much better off knowing I was alive and that I still loved them. "

Hard Working Blessed

Mr. Blessed retrieved Tank from a less adequate parent and a dangerous Chicago neighborhood of gangs, gunfire, and poor schools. Mrs. Blessed retrieved her 14-year old son The Rock from a loving but restrictive grandparent and a similarly unsafe Chicago neighborhood with poor schools. Tank told us that he particularly "appreciated" the fact that his new parents had high academic expectations for him:

"In Chicago, I knew I wasn't going to get nowhere just getting all D's and F's. My grades are better here. [Why?] They [parents] are always on us about our grades, so that is good, and they want us to work extra hard."

Tank Blessed

When we met the Blesseds in March 2000, the family had been together for a little over a year and Mr. Blessed had been working at Steel Mill & Foundry for 20 months. His hourly wage had progressed to $13/hour. Liberal overtime allowed him to bring home about $600 a week, but he had learned by this point that there were no advancement opportunities at his job. While the $2/hour wage increase meant nearly $4000 more annual income, this 'boon' did not last long. In a physically taxing entry-level job at age 40, Mr. Blessed suffered two herniated discs, got the flu repeatedly, and had pneumonia twice. A foreman told us that Mr. Blessed's branch of the company was known for "back injuries from lifting," like Mr. Blessed had.

Worse yet, Mr. Blessed's injuries resulted in a job demotion and wage reduction so that he struggled to make enough money for his family. The only means to more money were to work many overtime hours or change jobs. He tried overtime for a while, but found that having even less time with his son compounded Tank's school problems. Tank's worries about his "new" father's health manifested in preoccupation and lower grades at school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ultimately Mr. Blessed changed jobs, taking a forklift operator position at Printing Company on the basis of his MJI training and job experience. His felony background no longer thwarted his job pathway. He was hopeful about this new position, even though it was an initial setback in terms of wages. The new job offered more benefits and a 4-day/, 12/hour schedule followed by 3 days off—a schedule that Mr. Blessed thought would give him more time with his children. But he was exhausted by 12-hour days plus usually 1 day a week overtime. Adding to their stress, the family still struggled with $20,000 debt from Mr. Blessed's previous loans, schooling, child support, and unpaid bills, in addition to their normal expenses. During this stressful period, both sons' grades remained lower than desired or expected. The Blessed's level of burden is not experienced by new workers whose life stages "match" their employers' working conditions and entry-level wages.

In sum, Kevin McDonalds's and Hard Working Blessed's stories are two of many that show that even in the Jobs Initiative where the program aimed for higher level, higher wage jobs, the variable pace of wage growth together with debt and *life-stage mismatches* meant that the Jobs Initiative workers struggled to support their families. Families like these need sufficient time, energy and resources to compensate for earlier separations and build sufficient cultural capital such that their children can compete in school with more economically-advantaged peers. It is worrisome that even after more than three years of steady, hard work, Jobs Initiative workers might not move out of poverty, even when they employ multiple strategies to do so.

What families did to try to make more money...

As the McDonalds and Blessed family stories illustrated [above], parents tried to increase their income by working overtime and taking a second job, but these solutions had mixed effects on family welfare. Families also used income supplements and subsidies to make their incomes go further, but these enhancements were often cut off as soon as families made a little more money, but before they made enough money.

Family heads worked overtime to make more money

Working overtime was a particularly complicated influence on family well-being. While overtime was beneficial materially, it took parents away from parenting, limited their ability to oversee their children's homework and developmental needs, and resulted in sleep deprivation. Parents often worked all night and then went directly to school trips, conferences, or medical appointments, sacrificing sleep to earn money and fulfill parent responsibilities at the same time. Sleep deprivation may also have exacerbated on-job injuries.

Even more problematic for the long run, some employers offered overtime *instead* of base wage increases. Although bosses described this overtime as 'voluntary,' much of it was actually mandatory, which raised the question of employer adherence to Fair Labor Standards legislation. Increasing income through overtime is also less stable and less transferable than increasing base wages, resulting in a persistent barrier to moving up.

Family heads took on second jobs to make more money

Some family heads tried to make ends meet by taking on a second job. While this increased discretionary income or resulted for a time in a family-sustaining wage, additional work hours were hard on the family heads and drastically reduced the amount of time and attention parents could devote to their children. One family head worked over 70

hours a week, including Saturdays, leaving only Sunday for time with family members and sleep. Another worked a 40-hour/week main job, added 3 hours of upgrade training twice a week to his 8-hour workday that often included overtime, and 15 additional work hours a week at a second job. This work week also totaled at least 70 hours. Children in these families openly lamented their parents' absence and their school performance suffered in parallel.

Families relied on subsidies to make their money go further

Income-enhancement subsidies are intended to make low incomes stretch further. But Jobs Initiative families, similar to welfare-leavers (Dion & Pavetti, 2000), often did not know about subsidies for which they were eligible. Jobs Initiative case managers and program staff informed trainees about subsidies to some extent, but employers rarely gave such information to their workforce. While none of the Jobs Initiative families made full use of available subsidies, their use increased over the study period [see Appendix B]. It may be that welfare reform led Jobs Initiative projects to emphasize subsidy information more over time.

Almost all the families retained Medicaid health coverage for their children rather than use employer coverage that required co-pay. At the time, eligibility standards for state- or city-funded children's health insurance had been raised to include more needy children (Wysen & Curtis, 2001), and in Wisconsin parents also became selectively eligible. The families with infant children used WIC, the Special Supplemental Nutritional Program for Women, Infants, and Children aged one to five.

Consistent with the extremely high cost of housing in Seattle, three of the five SJI families utilized Section 8 housing subsidies. In one situation however, an immigrant refugee did not know that his radical wage reduction meant a parallel decrease in his housing co-pay. He would have continued to pay over 50% of his income to housing without the on-site researcher's alert. In contrast, the Seattle Housing Authority's Family Self-Sufficiency Program helped one Jobs Initiative worker move toward asset development through payment-matching that built an equity account for home purchase.

On the down side, stringent eligibility criteria meant that the Jobs Initiative families earned just a little too much money, "on paper," to be eligible for some subsidies. This family head succinctly expressed the sentiments of all the study workers:

> *"The trouble with advancement at work when you've been poor is that you don't earn more money because your benefits go away and your housing goes up. You get depressed. You can't help it."*
>
> Isabell Smith

Food Stamps was the most notable "missing" subsidy. Here again, the "real" sufficiency of the families' incomes was not used to calculate eligibility, thus their incomes looked "too high," particularly under the low standard of 130% FPL set by welfare reform. At the same time, families often ran out of food at the end of the month and wished desperately that they could feed their children better, as Tisha Shanks's experiences underscore.

Tisha Shanks's Story. Tisha Shanks was a 33-year old Hispanic mother of three teenagers whose participation in the Jobs Initiative gave her an opportunity to earn a living legally, employ her talents, vastly improve her children's welfare, and make a positive impact on her community—giant steps forward from a past of drug selling and incarceration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Moving Up is a Steep Climb

After prison, Tisha worked 26 weeks in 1998 for a total income of $6000. Better jobs were out of reach until she contacted the Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) manufacturing project and enrolled in training. Her guaranteed job at Product Manufacturing Company at $7.86/hour let her put at least part of her past in the past. Although she was saddled with almost $9000 in debt, Tisha believed her new job "offered the best opportunity to survive and not struggle." Tisha's wage gradually increased to $9.71/hour by the time we met her in February 2000, but was increasingly insufficient for her family's needs. In fact, her $19,420 annual income after almost 1½ years of employment equaled the poverty level for a family of five. Although she earned regular raises, she turned down an initial opportunity for promotion because she lacked self-confidence, which slowed her income progress. At the same time, the money Tisha earned went farther because she supplemented it with food stamps, Medicaid, free school lunch for the children, and used the Earned Income Tax Credit to pay down her debt.

At the 19-month mark, Tisha was temporarily laid off from Product Manufacturing Company due to a decrease in orders and production. Although she returned to work after one month, she felt her workplace was increasingly insecure. She enrolled in a dry wall apprenticeship and began to look for another job. This period was invigorating for Tisha, but also taxed her energy and left little time for family: "Home, school, and work—I was tiring myself out." She quickly found a new job as a spot welder for Steel Company at a starting wage of $10.93/hour—the only study participant whose job change resulted in a significantly higher base wage. Regular overtime raised her annual income to approximately $28,500—*potentially* $9000 more than her income at Product Manufacturing Company:

> *"I'm working 9½ hours a day and 8 hours on Saturdays. All I can think about is dollar signs. At my previous job, I could barely make ends meet. I couldn't do the things I wanted to do, like fix up the house and family activities."*
>
> Tisha Shanks

Tisha's children relished new family outings that helped heal scars from their encounters with the police during their mother's arrests and their separation from her during her incarceration. But they also needed her time. Their grades dropped when Tisha had to work 2nd shift (late afternoon to midnight) and they foundered under less after-school and weekend supervision. As a result, Tisha reduced her overtime work, cutting over $3000 annually from her potential new income but greatly improving her children's well-being. Their grades rose, they ventured into part-time jobs, they agreed to parent-supervised savings plans, and they became involved in more school and community activities. However, reducing overtime also reduced how far Tisha's income went. Despite the notable increase, her $25,000 income was below 150% FPL for a family of five. She resumed paying her bills piece-meal, made no progress on reducing her debt, and re-applied for food stamps. Because her new income put her $43 a month over the threshold for food stamp eligibility, her application was denied. Tisha described the punishing subsidy loss that her wage increase produced—a step backward to financial 'dependence' on others that many families experienced:

> *"$43 can't feed 5 people. If it wasn't for Maine [her boyfriend], I don't know how I would make it. If I had to do it myself, I'd have to call mom. We get up in the mornings to milk and cereal that Maine has provided."*
>
> Tisha Shanks

Most of the families used childcare subsidies to obtain quality, certified care for their children. The childcare subsidy was particularly critical in Seattle where the minimum cost for licensed care was $850/month per child. As incomes rose, families in both cities faced actual or threatened withdrawal of this valuable income enhancer. In the worst cases, children were switched to lower-quality, uncertified in-home daycare where valuable services were lost and children's health and development suffered.

***More Hard Working Blessed* Story.** The Blessed family lost their childcare subsidy when Mr. Blessed changed to a new job that made the family income look too high on paper. Before the loss, 1½ -year old Baby Miracle went daily to a high-quality, certified childcare facility that provided developmental stimulation, was clean and safe, and cost the family $5/week because of a $180/week subsidy. Baby Miracle's doctor emphasized that this bright, eager child needed such a quality facility. When the subsidy was withdrawn, the Blesseds switched Baby Miracle to an in-home daycare that cost $75/week. Even this payment was barely affordable as the family income was far less than it looked. The Blessed's ineligibility had been calculated according to an estimated amount of overtime, but in Mr. Blessed's new job, overtime was *not* a regular or stable source of income. In the in-home site, Baby Miracle frequently came home with diaper rashes and did not receive much developmental stimulation. Several months after the switch, Mrs. Blessed's health problems increased and she ultimately resigned from her job to care for Baby Miracle herself. As a result, the baby's health improved but the total family income plummeted.

Families used income supplements to make their money go further

Income supplements, such as the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), were particularly valuable wage enhancers for JI families. The EITC is a tax credit available to low-income households with earnings. It offsets taxes and, because it is refundable, it supplements the wages of families whose taxes are smaller than the credit. Importantly, and in concert with Jobs Initiative families' experiences, similar research reported that income supplements have a positive effect on the employment of workers leaving welfare, particularly if they are combined with services to help individuals prepare for work (Strawn & Martinson, 2000). Nine of our ten families learned about the EITC from the Initiative or other support resource and used the refund to pay off educational debt, rent, other arrears, and buy school clothes for fast-growing children. Most also preferred to get the EITC refund in a lump sum rather than monthly as legislators recently proposed:

> *"I've known about it [EITC] since my oldest boy was little. I use it every year; it's a wonderful thing. It makes a big difference in a little paycheck. I want mine at the end of the year, versus every paycheck."*
>
> Teresa Russell

Greater income sufficiency thus paved the way for Jobs Initiative parents to attend more fully to the needs of their children. Similar outcomes were found among children of welfare-leavers when parents' incomes were supplemented (Morris, Duncan, & Chase-Lansdale, 2001).

In sum, the Jobs Initiative families had good jobs, but despite hard work and creative strategies to supplement family income, they did not have enough money. Trying to survive financially also influenced parents' decisions about keeping or leaving their Jobs Initiative jobs. Workplace conditions and policies also influenced their decisions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Challenge #2. Trying to Stay Employed (Retention)

Staying at a job is commonly called "retention" in labor market terminology. There is no common definition of retention even though it is an outcome goal of TANF and WIA legislation. In the Jobs Initiative, "retention" is defined as staying in the labor market, although not necessarily at the initial placement, with less than 30 days unemployment between jobs (Giloth & Phillips, 2000). According to that definition, most of the study parents' retention rates were very high—approximately 90%. At the same time, rates alone obscure the fact that staying at a job was at times brutally punishing for both worker and family members, and changing jobs seldom moved the worker "up." The policies and practices of some Jobs Initiative employers helped parents meet both work and family responsibilities; those of other employers did not.

Vulnerable periods for new workers

Consistent with other research, we found that six months and one year were particularly vulnerable periods for job change (Clymer, Roberts, & Strawn, 2001). Some parents held their initial Jobs Initiative jobs for 1 to 2 years or more. Others made or considered job changes around 6 and 12 months, often because they were overwhelmed and exhausted by accumulated demands at work and at home, as both workers and case managers emphasized:

> *"I feel like I don't have enough energy to do everything and feel like I should. We are supposed to be the ones teaching them [children] how to be and raising them to be good people and yet we are the ones that are not here. [This is] the stress your family goes through when you start working again. There is no such thing as down time in my house…the only time I have is when I pass out from exhaustion."*
>
> Isabell Smith

> *"The one-year anniversary seems to be a pivotal period, often a tumultuous one. I suspect that individuals let down their guard at this time, maybe feeling confident that they have 'made it for a year' and now can resume earlier patterns, like substance use. It is also possible that family support systems weaken or family members' needs surface after a honeymoon period of parental work."*
>
> CBO Case Manager

Workplace racism also influenced job changes around the 6- and 12- month time periods. Hard Working Blessed's departure after 4 months in an otherwise-promising post-JI job epitomized experiences of other study parents:

> *"At first I didn't see it [race-related acts], but then… Other employees were rotten; they were jealous that I was in the position I was. They'd never had a person of color or a woman in that position. I had keys to every office; free rein in the building; a company car. At first there were covert slurs. A co-worker reported things that I wasn't doing. I got nasty e-mails. The guy who had the job before me, he was white. He was never reported. It started to get to me real bad. One supervisor said the worst things in the world—blamed me for everything. He said the pumps were leaking now and they weren't before I got the job. I'd leave the bucket, clean it, and the next day they'd be leaking again."*
>
> Hard Working Blessed

Mrs. Blessed graphically underscored how racism at work affected her husband's interactions with the family:

"During the last months at Printing Company, Hard Working put the weight of the family problems on his shoulders. It tears him up. He didn't shave; he didn't cut his hair."

Mrs. Blessed

How Jobs Initiative workers decided to stay at or leave jobs

Leaving one's job for a "better job" has traditionally been a strategy to earn more money and advance in one's career, particularly for managers and professionals. Welfare research found that job change was also an important mechanism for wage growth among low-skilled workers, but only in moderation. One voluntary job change per year was associated with higher wages, but more and involuntary job changes were associated with lower wages (Strawn & Martinson, 2000).

As discussed earlier, job change was generally lateral for Jobs Initiative workers, at least in terms of wages and income. This research also found that the effects of job change depended at least equally on whether it was planned or unplanned as on how many changes took place. Very few job changes were part of a considered, longer-term plan, but when they were, wages and responsibilities advanced and benefit coverage was seamless or quickly reinstated. Most of the parents' job changes were unplanned, and those that resulted from a precipitous response to harmful workplace conditions or immediate family needs resulted in a lateral or downward wage move. Periods between jobs were generally less than 30 days, but loss of health insurance coverage while job-hunting and on probation in a new job lasted up to 4 months, hurting children's health. Randy Jackson's wife illustrated this prevalent occurrence poignantly:

"We don't have any health insurance right now. It's tough on the kids. The kids have been sick a while. We only have money for over-the-counter medicine. We spend a lot of money on that. We used to take them to the Private Hospital, but now go to the County Hospital. We still have bills coming. The kids got ringworm in school, but we couldn't afford to take them to the doctor. The drugstore medicines didn't work very well. It took a long time to go away. We had to take them to the hospital."

Shawn Jackson

Only one employer informed departing Jobs Initiative workers about bridge health insurance under COBRA, the 1985 Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, even though employers are legally required to do so.

Ethnography also illuminated *how* Jobs Initiative workers made decisions about staying at or leaving a job. Essentially, family was always "front and center" in the decision process. Although income was also a major reason parents stayed or left, income was never considered independent of family needs—particularly children's immediate needs for parents' time and attention. Both male and female parents made decisions this way; neither their sentiments nor their actions were gendered. Most of the parents' "stay-or-leave" decisions ruefully but definitively prioritized children's immediate welfare over the longer-term "good" that might accompany longer job tenure.

"Family-friendly" workplaces generally increased retention

Workplace practices and policies were often the critical link between employee retention and termination or quitting. Examination of employers' practices and policies illuminated the minefield Jobs Initiative parents negotiated in order to fulfill their responsibilities at work and at home. Most employers had strict official attendance and absence policies, but immediate supervisors exercised a broad range of enforcement practices. Jobs Initiative parents stayed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

at jobs that were only moderately optimal in wages and advancement opportunity precisely because supervisors were flexible about attendance, as Teresa Russell's story typifies. Teresa's manager interpreted and implemented workplace policy in a family-supporting manner, enacting a form of "street level" supervision (Lipsky, 1980) that can help workers manage work and home demands, absent the kinds of additional supports that more economically-advantaged workers have.

***Teresa Russell's* Story.** Teresa Russell was a 43-year old African American single parent whose diverse employment history spanned nearly 25 years before she enrolled in the Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI). Although her "heart-string" was to be a caterer, a vocation she continued as an occasional "second" job, she pursued SJI's 12-week automotive training and was hired immediately as a utility person in Rental Car Company's auto maintenance department. Teresa's starting wage in January 2000 was $8.75/hour and was richly supplemented by a union-sponsored health, dental and eye-care benefit package that covered her own and her 10-year old son Tom's health needs, enabling Teresa to move him off Medicaid.

Expanding Tom's academic and enrichment options was Teresa's primary goal, one she felt acutely as she was Tom's sole parent. Because of the strong relationship between SJI, the automotive training program, and Rental Car Company, Teresa was able to negotiate an individualized work schedule of 30-hours a week during the school year, 8 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. This enabled her to deliver Tom to a friend before school and transport him after school to basketball, baseball, trumpet, and the community center. Her individualized work schedule also facilitated helping Tom with his reading and math difficulties and left time for dedicated service to their church community. Without JI intervention, Teresa would have to work a 5:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. shift. Such timing would not accommodate most children's schedules and would be particularly problematic for single parents like Teresa.

Over time Teresa missed work because of childcare concerns, truck problems, and Tom's needs, but official and unofficial company practices significantly eased her family pressures. Teresa credited her union for its family focus: "My job is union. It's set up for families." For example, the union's official policy was that any illness that spanned two consecutive workdays was counted as only one absence. She also credited the exemplary understanding of her manager who "unofficially" overlooked consistent absences and lateness based on understanding her life, the quality of her SJI training, and her work:

> *"Teresa is a really good person. Our company is innovative. Teresa takes a little more time than I'd like. We have a strict attendance policy—usually Teresa takes time without pay. She fits in good with the fellows. She was well trained and she's good at it—she makes few mistakes. The computer training at SJI helped a lot."*
>
> Rental Car Company manager

Because the carefully-crafted work schedule and ample benefits maximized her care of Tom, Teresa had already stayed at Rental Car Company longer than she had at any other job over her 25 years of work.

At the same time, "family-friendly" workplace policies and practices were sometimes double-edged. Tasha Jones's experience illustrates how a worker can be penalized when higher-level managers and "street level" supervisors interpret and implement policy differently.

Tasha Jones's Story. Tasha Jones was a 24-year old single African American mother of two who enrolled in Milwaukee Jobs Initiative's (MJI) manufacturing project's machine operator training in summer 1999. Following training, Tasha's assembly job at Manufacturing Company paid $9.84/hour which enabled her to move to a rented house independent of her parents and establish herself as primary parent to her one- and two-year old children.

After several months' employment, Tasha began to miss work, largely because of her own and her daughters' poor health. Although Tasha's supervisor was initially understanding about her absences, Tasha worried that health problems might cause her to lose her job:

> *"I'm worried about losing my job. I had the flu a couple of times this winter and I got bronchitis. After I gave birth to Nami I almost died of pneumonia. I had toxemia and high blood pressure and I still have chest pains. They've given me EKGs but can't find anything. If I turn left or a certain way, I have pain. I'm also short of breath. The doctor gave me an inhaler for when I'm short of breath. One big problem is that even though it's forbidden, my co-workers smoke on the job. This makes me more sick."*
>
> Tasha Jones

Her children's health problems caused even greater concern and significantly impacted Tasha's attendance:

> *"Nami is sickly—she's going to be part of a sleep study. She was born with a flat nose. She may need surgery. She breathes really loud at nighttime—like she's trying to catch her breath. I need to stay close at night because she can die in her sleep. I sleep good, but wake up a couple of times a night to check on her. The hard part is in the morning time, well first of all at night. I go to bed at 10:30 and wake up at 5:30. I can't really go to sleep until they both fall asleep. I will check her in the middle of the night to make sure she is okay. I have to get up early in the morning, dress them both, carry them both downstairs, come back up the stairs just to lock the doors up. I mean it is hard for me and I be too tired to get up any earlier and so that is the hard part."*
>
> Tasha Jones

At the official level, Manufacturing Company developed a strict 12-point system to deal with absenteeism in a consistent, uniform manner. If an employee missed a day of work due to illness or childcare problems they received one point (reduced to a half-point with a doctor's note). One manager admitted, "you can use up a lot of points with kids." After seven months employment, Tasha had not worked a 40-hour week for the past five months, which significantly impacted her monthly take home pay and reduced her potential above-poverty yearly income of about $20,000 to a real income of about $16,650/year, near poverty level.

At the same time, several factors eased Tasha's concern about the points she accumulated. First, her supervisor seemed to understand her family situation:

> *"Well, the new people have more family problems because they're younger and they have young people's problems, like childcare. But they're different, more are divorced than the old workers were. There are more single parents and that makes things more difficult for them, and that affects work. Absenteeism is greater than it was in 1975. More time is missed today for family life."*
>
> Manufacturing Company supervisor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Second, Tasha's supervisor had not warned her about absenteeism, even though workplace policy mandated written warnings at three and six months. Third, Tasha saw co-workers take personal leave to handle childcare or personal problems and later return to work.

Company enlightenment was double-edged in Tasha's case. The department head eventually restricted Tasha's supervisor's flexibility about absenteeism. The supervisor responded with new, rigid enforcement of the rules, seemingly without conveying the change to Tasha. When Tasha took personal leave to address Nami's worsened health, she expected to return to Manufacturing Company at a later point. Because Tasha never fully understood how the point system was being applied to her, because she did not know how to negotiate adequate terms for personal leave, and perhaps because she also felt a sense of relief from family pressures, she took no further action when she received an official termination letter in April 2000. While subsequent unemployment gave Tasha more time and energy for her children, her goal of enrolling them in a pre-school that would increase their developmental gains was no longer affordable.

Workplace safety influenced retention

Workplace safety also emerged as a significant reason for 'stay-or-leave' decisions. At the time of our study, Jobs Initiative trainees were taught more about how to cope with mental than physical demands of a job. In fact, the stresses from pre-JI and persistent challenges, such as debt and partner's unemployment, compounded the physical demands on the new workers. Workplace injuries among immigrants were exacerbated by language comprehension and supervisory miscommunication. Immigrants often did not understand injury-report practices at their jobsite.

Half the study parents sustained serious injuries in their Jobs Initiative jobs, largely but not exclusively in manufacturing positions. The workers' injuries included burnt hands, herniated discs, flu, pneumonia, aggravated food allergies (non-JI job), back injuries that became chronic, and tendonitis. Three of the five injured workers quit because of their injuries and located similar but safer employment, although one new job was at a substantially lower wage and responsibility level. The other injured workers remained at their jobs because changing jobs was more threatening or because the workplace accommodated their disability, as Maya Vanderhand's experience illustrates.

***Maya Vanderhand's* Story.** Maya Vanderhand was a 32-year old Hispanic woman who immigrated in late childhood to California. Maya dropped out of school at the end of 10th grade, met and married Jesus, and moved to Seattle for work. By the late 1990s, Maya was a mother of four children, ranging from first to seventh grade, who had worked for two years as a lead cashier in a military office. Her top wage there was $8/hour for a 20-hour workweek and an annual income of about $8000. In early 1998, Maya left the cashier job, spent a few months at home with her children, and subsequently enrolled in one of the first cohorts of Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) office occupations training. Despite lack of a GED, SJI training catapulted Maya into the position of personal lines operator at Insurance Company where she started at $24,000/year with benefits—a salary that was $16,000 greater than that of her previous job and one that fortuitously covered her medical needs.

When we first met Maya and her family in March 2000, she had worked at Insurance Company for just over one year and her annual salary had increased to $25,800. The Jobs Initiative thus gave Maya an opportunity to excel in her work and conduct herself professionally in a corporate environment—a far cry from being lead cashier. At the same time, a workplace injury threatened to derail her work progress and her family's economic stability.

Ten months into her job, Maya developed an increasingly severe case of tendonitis in her wrists and hands that was ultimately declared an "on-job injury." In response, the company brought in a specialist to set up her workstation to be ergonomically correct and her supervisor was authorized to provide any material supplies she might need:

> *"My boss came in and said, 'anything you need, you let me know. I am in charge of supplies, just order it.' [He] also says he'll do anything he can do—100%. I can delegate my job duties. I'll need to train someone."*
>
> Maya Vanderhand

These workplace supports allowed Maya to keep the job and income that were essential to her family, as Jesus had several periods of employment over the same period. Although Maya's company may only have been complying with legal requirements for employees with on-job injuries, its response enabled her to remain a model of work responsibility for her children. Maya's children drew on this model when they had problems adjusting to a more academically demanding school, as the details of the elder daughter's career goals suggest:

> *"I want to be an interior designer [showed us a 2-page Internet description of how to become an interior designer]. I designed a dream house with a tennis court, swimming pool, more rooms, an escalator, and a 'secret room.'"*
>
> 13-year old Iesha Vanderhand

As a result of workplace supports, Maya continued to provide the family's main financial support, build confidence in her work, remain a model "worker" for her children, and reward the company with loyalty.

Supportive program relationships helped workers stay at jobs

Listening, active outreach, individualized attention, orderly service transfer, resource provision and referral, and sustained relationship were key program support strategies that helped Jobs Initiative workers negotiate new work and family responsibilities and stay employed, as Isabell Smith's story dramatically exemplifies.

***Isabell Smith* Story.** Thirty-one year old Hispanic-American Isabell Smith's ability to seek and utilize supports was a critical feature of her success in the Jobs Initiative. Lacking family supports, Isabell created a network of service providers and select friends to counteract the ravages of former abuse and heroin use and dramatically improve her children's well-being.

Isabell left home at age 18 after years of physical and sexual abuse and obtained a series of low-wage or low-level managerial positions because of her "reliable" reputation. Isabell connected her work ethic with the non-abusive part of her past: "I come from a family that always worked very hard. They do a lot and you just don't complain about being tired, you just keep going." In her early twenties, Isabell was diagnosed with Blackfan-Diamond syndrome, a rare and often fatal blood disorder, that she interpreted as certain death:

> *"I felt like somebody had just stamped an expiration date on my forehead. They told me I was going to die within ten years."*
>
> Isabell Smith

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a result, Isabell "went off the deep end for a while," which meant showing up to work sporadically and often "high." Isabell eventually worked for a fishing company in Alaska, a seasonal position she held for about five years, where she discovered her desire and ability to work hard, a pattern that repeated itself at her Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) job: "I got to be a trailblazer." At the same time, she also discovered her "sea of self-hatred" which she connected with her vulnerability to drugs, including heroin.

In October 1995, Isabell's first son, Batman, was born addicted to heroin, placed in the custody of Children's Protective Services (CPS), and eventually placed with her partner Dominic's relatives. In September 1997, five years into her addiction, and eight months pregnant with Dominic's son, Scooby-Doo, Isabell entered a rehabilitation facility in order to prevent foster placement of her second child. Although Scooby-Doo was born with methadone and heroin in his system, Isabell was permitted to keep custody of him on the condition she remain in the residential facility. During this period Isabell arranged for 11-month old Scooby-Doo's acceptance into Childhaven, a highly-reputed therapeutic child development agency for at-risk children with special needs. Isabell's observations about Scooby Doo, that "He was far behind other one year olds. He couldn't walk, he could not talk at all, not even a word," were confirmed by Childhaven staff:

> *"Scooby-Doo was like many floppy drug-affected babies; we wondered if he would walk."*
>
> Childhaven social worker

After 18 months of rehabilitation—Isabell's first experience of sustained support—she moved to an apartment that was affordable because of a Section 8 rental subsidy. At the same time, Isabell and CPS staff advocated successfully for Batman's return to her. For various reasons, Isabell saw Batman only sporadically during his years in foster care and so his "return" to her care at age 3 1/2 was more aptly their introduction to one another. Batman's entrance into the family was the biggest adjustment for all four family members during Isabell's transition to work. Its challenge was exacerbated by Childhaven's assessment that Batman had been abused while in kinship care, as his initial responses to maternal discipline suggested:

> *"When he first moved into the house and the first time he had ever got in trouble he says 'are you going to lock me in the bathroom?' 'We don't lock people in the bathroom in this house,' I said. He said 'are you going to hit me then?' and I said 'we don't hit people either.'"*
>
> Isabell Smith

Recognizing his needs as she had Scooby-Doo's, Isabell also negotiated Batman's enrollment in Childhaven. With their help, Isabell understood Batman's behavior as stemming from his experience: he rarely cuddled with her, was often confused about her parenting role, tested limits, refused the help he needed (for example, to tie his shoes), protested leaving child care and engaged in long crying spells before Isabell left for work in the morning. Batman's behavior commanded capacities for time and patience that rarely exist under the best of circumstances. For Isabell, struggling with a demanding new job, it was often overwhelming:

> *"I get so frustrated because I talk to Childhaven and I talk to a therapist and I talked to this lady who taught my parenting classes and Batman is really a difficult child."*
>
> Isabell Smith

Isabell consulted with Childhaven's teachers and case manager at will: several times daily during times of greatest need. With this help, she was able to parent less reactively, even under stress. Recognizing the vulnerability that stemmed from her abusive background, Isabell and Childhaven staff viewed these contacts as critical to preventing a further generation of abuse.

Supportive relationships were as critical to Isabell's training and employment as they were to her children's development. In March 1999, one month into her new home and family of four, Isabell considered SJI Office Occupations training. Isabell's SJI-CBO case manager helped her cope with multiple, concurrent transitions:

> *""L" was my original case manager, she was so awesome. I was trying to do everything and I was moving, getting my son back for the first time, supposed to start school at the same time and I called her up freaking out. She was great, and she told me, 'girl, you are nervous, but don't worry about it, school will still be there, you can do the one in June.'"*
>
> Isabell Smith

The case manager's validation calmed Isabell's quickly escalating sense of failure and allowed her to prioritize her commitments. As a result, Isabell postponed training for several months.

As part of the 12-week office training, Isabell worked for five weeks as an intern with Dot-Com, an internet-based distributor of books and sundry products. Isabell credited the skills she gained in training with her ability to get a job there as a Customer Service Representative:

> *"I haven't worked in many, many years [since 1996]. I never would have gotten a job like I have today if I hadn't had the opportunity to go to school. I'd still be stuck at 7-11 or McDonalds."*
>
> Isabell Smith

Getting the job was only the first hurdle. Isabell described her early days at Dot-Com as "so scary, especially when you are now talking to real people." While under the best circumstances transitions are stressful, Isabell's job became more intense as the company prepared for the holiday retail season. Within the first two months of employment, Isabell's work schedule changed three times. By late November she was working fifty-five "mandatory" hours per week, over ten hours a day on the phone with mostly disgruntled customers:

> *"It is very high pressured job especially because I got hired on right before the holiday season and we ended up being on the phones ten hours a day, just phone call after phone call. It was just nuts and people were upset and they were screaming at us."*
>
> Isabell Smith

Creating routine and structure for herself and her family was new enough, as was the ability to make mistakes and move forward; having to do so within a consistently shifting framework and under duress was, as Isabell described it, "like going into a war zone." Isabell's strain was exacerbated by a history of negative family 'messages' about performance:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"I was raised that if you did anything wrong you deserve to die for it. I mean that is what was embedded into my brain so that whenever somebody tells me 'you are not doing this right,' I completely fall apart. I am working on it."

Isabell Smith

The fact that Isabell survived her first few months of work, when demands were highest and her training, preparedness and confidence lowest, was testament to her resilience and sustained supports. When she was home with the children, they often competed for her attention and threw tantrums that she had little energy to resolve. The tumult of this period was confirmed by Childhaven staff who observed that the children were more aggressive in the classroom and Isabell had much less time to communicate with them about the children.

Burdens accumulated before SJI posed additional challenge to Isabell's work stability and burgeoning self-confidence:

"I got Batman, moved, went to school, got a job, and here we are. I have a job, I got car, I got my kids, I got a nice home. I got everything I always wanted. [Sense of accomplishment?] I am working on it and you caught me at another trying period because now I have got Child Support after me for child support I didn't know that I had to pay."

Isabell Smith

Just as Dot-Com and Isabell regained balance after the stressful holiday period, Isabell received a distressing call at work from the Child Support Enforcement Office, a call that set her apart from her coworkers and challenged her ability to keep work, family and history separate. She learned that she was being held retroactively responsible for the cost of Batman's years in foster care. Having to address it at work, in a public forum comprised of few workers with families, increased her burden:

"This guy calls me at work and he said I owe $14,000 and he wanted to garnish me. He kept wanting me to say at work that the reason why I didn't have my kid is because I was a heroin, he wanted me to say 'junky' on the phone and I was like 'I am not going to say it because I am at work.'"

Isabell Smith

Once again Isabell marshaled her supports: a new caseworker at Child Protective Services, a counselor at Scooby-Doo's high-risk health clinic, and for the first time her new SJI case manager. After a laborious documentation process, these services helped Isabell demonstrate poverty status during Batman's time in care and reduce the amount she owed from $14,000 to $900.

Isabell emphasized how her particularly attentive case manager's listening helped her remain stable during such tumultuous times:

"The more I talk about it the less power it has because [until] I outlet it, I don't see the good stuff. I sometimes just see all the bad things that are happening and the more I talk about it, it is like 'you know, things are pretty darn good."

Isabell Smith

But Isabell also needed her workplace to listen. Because the company valued innovation, it hired employees who were willing to devote their full energies to the company—primarily young, single individuals without families:

"I am the only one in the group who has children. No one understands what I go through—when a kid fell down the stairs or I tripped on the way to the car. It gets a little frustrating sometimes. I don't go home to my cat like they do. It's my hardest job ever—a challenge—but I like it. I've got to make them more family-oriented though."

Isabell Smith

By our last contact with Isabell in June 2001, the contribution of her supportive relationships was evident. She had sustained 19 months' employment at Dot-Com, she had been promoted once, and her wages increased from $11/hour to $13/hour. Her children's gains were equally impressive. Batman "graduated" from Childhaven in September 2000, after fifteen months of treatment, and his carefully chosen childcare facility confirmed and reinforced his gains in ways that translated into more positive behavior at home:

"He acted out a couple of times, but after that we talked about it and he has been pretty good since at school [childcare]. His getting in trouble here [at home] has toned down a lot too. He used to get in trouble daily and it has gotten a lot better."

Isabell Smith

Similarly, by Spring 2001, Scooby-Doo had progressed from an initial diagnosis of "Developmentally Disabled" to "Developmentally Immature." Childhaven professionals predicted that he would eventually be able to enroll in a mainstream kindergarten class.

Perhaps most important for policy consideration, Scooby-Doo's gains were consolidated by the fact that although he was past his state-allotted 15 months' treatment, he was able to remain at Childhaven to receive the care that not only helped him but Batman and Isabell as well. Isabell's case management was informally extended beyond the 2-year mark as well, which similarly consolidated family gains. A "success story" to be sure—but one that depended on sustained supportive relationships and resources that remain necessary, to some extent, as Isabell was facing permanent layoff and threatened withdrawal of her vital childcare subsidy.

Some new workers need post-employment supports and resources for more than two years

Mike Jeremy's story, like Isabell Smith's, highlights that some new workers need supportive post-employment relationships and resources for more than two years.

***Mike Jeremy's* Story.** In 1991, then-33 year old Mike Jeremy immigrated to the United States as a political refugee from an embattled African country. Mike had studied road/property surveying for three years at a technical college in Africa, but his minimal English language skills and lack of American educational equivalency certification prevented him from continuing his former trade in the United States.

After returning to Africa in the mid-1990s for his bride, and subsequently becoming a father, Mike needed a more productive career direction than the Certified Nursing Assistant position that paid $8.65/hour. He was referred to the Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) through African friends who had participated in SJI. Ideally, SJI offered Mike access

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to a formal network of employers that offered higher wages and benefits than his informal network in the African community could access.

At age 40, Mike began a three-month SJI training program in Computer Numerical Control (CNC) for machine tool operation. Unfortunately, CNC employers were suffering an industry downturn and eventually withdrew from the Initiative network. As a result, Mike took a production assembly line position at Equipment Manufacturer for $11.50 per hour that at least offered health benefits and potential wage increases and advancement.

Equipment Manufacturer's motto emphasized heavy lifting, which characterized both the nature of the company and Mike's work. On-site observations underscored Mike's work experiences: "Impersonal; hard work; tough work; very fast paced; a dangerous environment; and more Asian than African." By January 2000, after almost one year at the company, Mike suffered from debilitating back pain attributed to an on-the-job injury and the daily strain of alternately lifting heavy objects and standing in place. Mike's schedule of four ten-hour days per week, 5:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., and harsh working conditions also took a toll on his family:

> *"I was sick. The day before I quit, I had another accident. It's hard to put screwdrivers in; sometimes the hand turns. I hurt my hand and they took me to the first aid office. I couldn't stay there any longer. My family is my first priority."*
>
> Mike Jeremy

Mike's workplace injuries resulted from multiple, interrelated elements: his physical condition, language comprehension, and supervisory practices—elements that signaled the need for long-term case management intervention and advice. Had Mike not been past his allotted year of CBO service, and nearly past the second year of less intense post-employment contact, a case manager might have learned that the family was in dire need of intervention. Mike needed safer work and his 3-year old needed pre-school, but school was one of the several American social institutions that Mike and his wife did not know how to access.

Instead, left on his own, Mike quit Equipment Manufacturer in April 2000 after 16 months' employment. His reemployment was thus relegated to the African-community network of job seekers who found him an attendant position at Parking Company in downtown Seattle. The new position paid $8.50 per hour, almost $4/hour less than his JI job wage, no benefits, and a schedule of 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. five days per week. Illustrating its long-term *non*-potential, Parking Company would never offer benefits, even for a full-time position.

Mike's views about this research underscored the utility of a supportive relationship well beyond even the two-year mark:

> ***[Researcher]*** *What was it like for you being part of this study?*
> ***[Mike Jeremy, 2½ years after SJI training and employment]*** *It's ok. It's good. We learn a lot of things—get a lot of help to talk; suggestions to do. To ask is information. Otherwise, there aren't any persons helping. We are sharing our problems together and that's a help.*

Retention support means family assessment

The new Jobs Initiative workers were part of an intricate web of family relationships that influenced what and how they thought about their work futures. Getting and keeping a job is not a simple act of an individual; it involves family members' needs and the worker's family roles at the same time. Family members encouraged or derailed the new worker's job efforts in ways that might have been supported or averted by formal assessment of the entire family's needs. Having an unemployed spouse, a partner forced into low-paid underground work because of legal problems, children with special medical or health needs, or children who were trying to overcome past separation and challenge signaled viewing job pathways in the context of the family.

Immigrant workers particularly needed family assessment, as Mike Jeremy's experience exemplified [above]. Many immigrant families did not know how to navigate American social institutions such as the housing authority, subsidies and benefits, schools, courts, and medical facilities, as Mike expressed succinctly:

> *"My problem is the American way to live and even to join the community, for example."*
>
> Mike Jeremy

Some immigrant parents did not know at what age American children normally start school or pre-school. And even when families knew how to access institutions, it took an enormous amount of time and skills to negotiate effectively with them in a second language. These efforts were clearly associated with retention through their impact on the worker's fatigue, job satisfaction, and job attendance.

Jobs Initiative support groups provided a valuable resource for immigrants' acculturation:

> *"He found it useful. A lot of immigrants use the space to get understanding of culture. They listen to what others say—get clues to what others are doing."*
>
> CBO Case Manager

Post-employment seminars and workplace mentors might similarly help families navigate American institutions.

Family assessment among immigrants and non-immigrants alike can encompass the obvious barriers to sustained employment so that workers or their partners do not inadvertently derail each other's work efforts. Felony backgrounds, substance abuse histories, mental health concerns, and lack of education are just a few such barriers highlighted by CBO case managers:

> *"There's so much that needs to be done with people just to get them prepared for training. I now say, 'you're not ready.' This 'xxx' issue—handle that first; then come back. With this economic market, if you don't have any issues, you've got a job. The people coming in now are harder, more complex."*
>
> CBO Case Manager

King and Elliot's (2000) recent report offers valuable models for family-centered employment strategies. Outreach to partners might contribute to the retention and advancement of Jobs Initiative workers by extending *both* adults' career pathways so that one parent does not carry the whole burden.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Retention support also includes transportation

Transportation dilemmas were not the most difficult problem for Jobs Initiative workers, but were often the "straw" that tipped the retention balance. Even though most of the study families had the "luxury" of a car, the cars were 10-15 years old and vulnerable to breakdown and unplanned, unaffordable costs:

> *"It's hard to maintain quality of life. Every penny is accounted for. We shelled out over $900 last week on Mrs. Blessed's car. I have $1.35 to last for 2 weeks—and half a tank of gas in the car."*
>
> Hard Working Blessed

Gas and bus vouchers had been an important material support during Jobs Initiative training and continued to be available on request. The Jobs Initiatives worked on inner-city transportation problems systemically as well, advocating and partnering with city agencies to get graduates to employment sites. New bus routes and extra hours of service were added and creative van service-employer arrangements were crafted. But cost and access were only two of many complex ways that transportation problems complicated Jobs Initiative workers' lives, as Isabell Smith's experiences typify.

***More Isabell Smith* Story.** When she was hired by Dot-Com, Isabell Smith located a licensed home-based facility for morning and afternoon childcare that was carefully selected to reinforce the gains her children made in the therapeutic development program they attended earlier each day. In Isabell's first months on the job, she drove to work and parked downtown at a cost of $11 per day. During the holiday season when she was forced to work extra hours, parking cost $20 per day. Realizing she could not afford this cost, Isabell began to take public transportation. Unfortunately, the misfit between her work demands and an erratic bus schedule frequently made her late for childcare pick-up. At a cost of *$2 for every minute late*, this was an extra cost she could ill afford. Childcare fines up to $60 a day were untenable extra costs to a family whose income was well below self-sufficiency.

A secondary "cost" of public transportation was the fact that it robbed Isabell of her only "alone" time—time she took in her car to sing, cry, and make the transition from her extremely stressful work day to an often similarly stressful home where her two small children let off the steam they had accumulated during their long day of therapy and daycare. Isabell suffered indirect transportation dilemmas also in the form of $7000 debt that was partly due to fines for unpaid tickets that her ex-husband accumulated before she took her name off the car title. Similar problems with fines have been documented in welfare-to-work research (Nightingale & Mikelson, 2000); these other problems have not been documented.

Challenge #3. Trying to Move Forward (Advancement)

"Good jobs" started Jobs Initiative workers on upward job pathways. The problem of making enough money slowed their progress, but policy supports, family-friendly workplaces, and post-employment supports kept them moving forward. But to a one, Jobs Initiative workers said they needed more education and training to *really* move up.

Advancement means getting more education

More education generally means more money. Related research among welfare-leavers found a strong positive link between education and wages over time (Strawn & Martinson, 2000). Other research found that welfare-leavers with

skills comparable to women with some post-secondary education, or even to high school graduates in the lower half of their class, could move up to jobs that pay up to $10,000 more by investing in 200 hours (1 full semester of courses) of education and training (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999). In the experience of one Jobs Initiative project, a GED was worth about $2 additional wages per hour (Parker & Nichols, 2001), a sizeable $4,160/year.

The Jobs Initiative's valuable pre-employment skill training helped trainees access good-paying jobs. But getting more education and training proved to be well beyond what most of the families could do, even three or more years into "good jobs." Parents were exhausted after long days at work and wanted to spend what little time they had with their children. The children sorely needed parent time to compensate for previous separations, new family configurations, inadequate urban schools, and language challenges. More education and training also meant more expense. Even when employers reimbursed enrollment fees, few families had up-front money for courses. Goals of professional or college education were even more unrealistic, as available grants and stipends did not begin to equal foregone earnings. Access to education was also difficult because work hours and course times rarely coincided. Earlier research underscored that community and vocational colleges seldom offer off-time and weekend courses, few provide childcare, and many are of questionable quality (Carnevale & Desrochers, 1999).

Without basic education and GEDs, workers cannot move up. The first step in the education-equals-money chain is a high school diploma or GED. In contrast to how Jobs Initiative "legitimization" was portable for felons, it was limited to initial job access for workers without a high school diploma or GED. Despite varied reports about the value of the GED compared to a high school diploma (Cameron & Heckman, 1993; Cao, Stromsdorfer, & Weeks, 1996), this research found that family heads could not advance far in their JI-attained jobs, change jobs, or pursue further education and training without one of these crucial credentials. In this study, immigrant workers most starkly exemplified the penalties of no credential, as Lucky Miracle's story highlights.

***Lucky Miracle's* Story.** After decades of revolution, dislocation, political persecution, young adult emigration, and adult readjustment, 43-year old Lucky Miracle and his family were living a comfortable life in a Seattle exurb. The children were beautiful and well adjusted, both parents were employed, and family supports abounded. At the same time, byproducts of Lucky's life cataclysms persisted in subtle ways, limiting both his work pathway and development of cultural capital for his children.

Many years earlier, after high school completion, army service, and several years' work as a retail clothes salesman on his way to having his own clothing manufacturing business, Lucky and his parents fled their Asian home country when Communist insurgents took over. They were interned in a refugee camp in Indonesia for 16 months that Lucky described as "Terrible. It was a jungle. We had to chop the trees to build a house."

Lucky eventually reached Los Angeles by boat in 1980 at age 26, knowing no English at the time. He soon moved to Washington state, enrolled in ESL classes, and thought about getting a GED, but work demands prevented enough study time. Lucky also worried that the test would be difficult:

> *"Some people say the GED is pretty easy. I said, 'Well I don't think so.' High school I think was easier. GED is not that easy."*
>
> Lucky Miracle

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Lucky wanted to become a policeman, but lacked official certification of his Asian education because he was forced to leave his important belongings when he fled the country. This was particularly unfortunate because Lucky's Asian high school education was an elite one—paid for by scholarship and parents who scrimped to do so. Pursuit of sales work in the U.S. was also stymied by no certificate, as well as by the need for a license, language limitations, and no American sales track record. After a decade of menial jobs, in 1991 Lucky was hired by Food Company's shipping and receiving department where he remained employed, during and after Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) training, in a position with decreasing benefits, minimal wage increases, and no way to advance.

The Jobs Initiative aimed to compensate for the gap between Lucky's competencies and his attainment. Lucky's CBO affiliate categorized him as under-employed [job content and wages that do not reflect attained education and skills], and referred him to the Initiative's general manufacturing training program. A complex constellation of events prevented Lucky from getting placed by the Jobs Initiative, but lack of a GED remained his largest employment hurdle. Lucky lamented that he was not able to complete GED training through the Initiative, as his earlier GED training had been confusing and discouraging:

> *"That would have been wonderful! Because I would try to contact SJI, I try to go to Goodwill, they have a GED training but it takes long, long, long time because one night for school. The most of it you study by yourself, instead of study by yourself they want you to go to school. Like that book, I try to go, I want to get a GED package since I would say fifteen years ago, but I don't have any clue how to get them because history in the U.S., I don't know that much. You have to pass them, the math, I can't do that."*
>
> Lucky Miracle

Lucky urged workforce programs to be more actively involved in trainees' GED attainment and issued a similar mandate to immigration policymakers as well:

> *"If they can help people get a GED, they can get the other job. I would say in the future the policies for the country for all the new immigrants will be to try to let them easier to get a GED. [What would make it easier to get it?] In general the language and some of the stuff could be a little bit easier. Because I know a GED is not easy to get, you have to pass this and pass that and if you fail just go back again because people can, all the immigrants can get a GED. You know most of the people when you come over, like I come over this country my age is over, I cannot go to high school, but by that time I didn't know about GED until I found it out a few years too late."*
>
> Lucky Miracle

Had Lucky been able to transcend cultural and educational hurdles to better employment, he might have reached his goal of providing his children with resources and opportunities, such as a home computer and summer enrichment programs, that give economically-advantaged children the edge in life attainment.

Without upgrade education and training, workers cannot move up. Two basic routes are available for employed workers to further their skills: on-job and off-job. On-job upgrade training is presently available to about two-thirds of the workforce nationally, but is mainly offered to managers, supervisors, the sales force, technical workers, and professionals (Wever, Berg & Kochan, 1994). Jobs Initiative and other workforce program graduates do not usually hold such positions.

Some employers in this study offered "Learners' Centers" for on-site advancement, particularly in the manufacturing industry where unions encouraged upgrade opportunities for all employee levels. Although staffed by technical instructors, the centers more commonly offered personal enrichment activities over lunch and break periods, such as yoga and tai chi, rather than skill instruction. Because employers did not give release time for upgrade instruction, attending a skills class before or after work meant additional and unacceptable time away from children. As a result, none of the JI family heads made use of on-job training:

> *"Some of the advancement could take more hours and more days and I don't think I would be able to do that because the more time I spend with my [pre-school] children is the best time I could spend with them."*
>
> Tasha Jones

Off-job education and training was a "luxury" that few could afford. Even when courses were subsidized or reimbursed, off-job training imposed parent time and financial penalties on children. Apprenticeships posed a unique set of problems for the Jobs Initiative families. Relatively low wages in the early apprenticeship years did not coincide with workers' need to support their families. This was another example of a *life-stage mismatch* between traditional industry pathways, where young, single individuals are the usual apprenticeship students, and the more complicated life situations that Jobs Initiative workers bring to such positions, as Randy Jackson's experience illustrates.

***Randy Jackson's* Story**. Although he earned a Bachelor's of Science degree in biology at his African country's premier university, 40-year old Randy Jackson worked in maintenance management for his first 9 years in the U.S. because employers did not recognize his African university education. The Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) moved him into a high-paying construction position that allowed him to spend daily and weekend time with his two young children that the maintenance job had not allowed. The "family-friendly" schedule also left more time for school conferences and teacher consultation to resolve the behavior and academic problems of his 6-year old son.

At the same time, Randy deeply wanted to pursue a career in law or medicine, building on his African science training, but his family could not afford the cut in income. Randy's wife did not work outside the home, and even if she did, her earning power would be low. Instead, Randy pursued electrical apprenticeship at the MJI construction project. He just missed passing the industry apprenticeship exam because he had no experience with American "test-taking skills:"

> *"I went to the first questions, they were the hardest, and I did them all. I finished 29 out of 36 questions. I didn't look ahead to see that the easiest questions were at the end. I should have looked at the whole test and answered the last questions first then gone back and answered the first questions, then I would have got them all done."*
>
> Randy Jackson

Although he could retake the exam, he learned that he would not earn his current income ($16.40/hour) as an apprentice for at least two years. As the sole family wage earner, Randy could not afford this opportunity cost. Thus, he remained in a construction position that offered regular wage increases in the short run, but a limited wage ceiling in the long run. Randy's family's *stability* was enhanced by the Jobs Initiative, but its *mobility* was constrained by financial barriers to career development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advancement means helping new workers learn about "career development"

Realistically, career knowledge is cumulative, accrued over many years through different contacts and examples. Jobs Initiative workers lacked this kind of social capital. Most did not understand how to move up and what it would really mean to them and their families to "develop a career." They generally characterized "advancement" in terms of wage increase rather than in terms of incremental skill attainment, additional responsibility, or identified "steps" toward a career:

> *"At Printing Company the money was $100 better. I'd say I advanced."*
>
> Hard Working Blessed

It was also striking that Jobs Initiative staff, employers and workers perceived advancement differently. Jobs Initiative staff perceived advancement as "time-"dependent: "If she finds the time to get training, she can advance." Employers viewed advancement as "skill-" dependent: "Advancement depends both on openings and skills." In contrast, new workers perceived and weighed "advancement" in relation to family priorities and life values:

> *"I don't think I'll ever want to be a manager. I like my hours. Like the flexibility. Like the low-key environment. Money is not all that is important to me. What people have to realize is that there is nothing wrong with being a worker who just likes to do what they know and then put their time into things that they care about—like church."*
>
> Teresa Russell

Advancement strategies ideally mean helping new workers understand the steps of career paths, as Kevin McDonalds's experience illustrates.

More of Kevin McDonalds's Story. Kevin McDonalds was one of several who castigated urban high schools for restricting knowledge about "career" options and processes:

> *"When I grew up, for Blacks and Latinos there were only two things pumped—college and the armed forces. We were not told about different apprenticeships, different skilled trades. We were just told if you didn't have college, you couldn't succeed. If the high schools had information about the trades, a lot more people would do it. They could introduce us to what was going on. We could have seen more things we could do. If we didn't want to go to college, or to the armed services, we had the sense that there was nothing else we could do. With information about these other possibilities, it would not have seemed just like a dead end."*
>
> Kevin McDonalds

Kevin believed that he might have sought an apprenticeship out of high school if he had known about that route, since he did not view himself as college-bound, and rued the time lost between high school and his connection with the Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI):

"I probably would have done it. I don't mind going to school, but I'm not a college-bound type of person. I tried it—but I was discouraged. If you're not good at school—then what! You don't feel like there are any options. Now I'm in school at [MJI Printing Project]. But it would be much better if the program [MJI] were going to the high schools. Tell them about the possibilities beyond college and the armed forces. Give them choices, options."

Kevin McDonalds

Importantly employer- and advancement-oriented, Kevin's MJI project taught him about career "steps." Kevin attended 3-hour printing classes for "jogger" and "press operator" at the project one to two mornings a week after his all-night shift. He planned next to take computer classes for the press, showing new understanding that skill expansion was critical to developing a printing career. He also began to understand more about the portability of his skills:

"You can really get ahead in this business. There is a lot of opportunity to do that. You can just keep moving up by taking classes. I don't know if I want to stay in it, but you learn a lot of things that will help. The classes are easy. Except going there after work."

Kevin McDonalds

Kevin also learned that career paths are influenced by industry particularities. Advancement in the printing industry depends on staying with one employer, an increasingly rare job pathway in today's labor market but one with major implications for retention. He also learned that advancement was contingent on open slots that might take years to reach.

"I'm something like #27 now on the list for the next promotion. It will probably take 3-4 years until the next position, 5 at most."

Kevin McDonalds

Advancement means helping new workers resolve alternative career interests

Learning about "career" processes was further complicated by the fact that none of the Jobs Initiative workers were doing what they said they really wanted to do. Having alternative life and employment goals emerged as a significant influence on "moving up," delimiting some workers' interest in learning how job "A" may lead to job "B" and ultimately to career "C." Although mobility was a Jobs Initiative goal, participants were essentially guided into new job pathways with the projects' industry partners.

In this research, the auto service worker wanted to be a caterer. The manufacturing workers wanted to be a journalist, social service worker or office worker. Only one wanted to stay in manufacturing and work eventually for Harley-Davidson. The construction worker wanted to be a doctor or lawyer, a reasonable goal considering his university education in Africa. The printing industry worker wanted to own a club that provided music, safety, and community for inner-city African Americans. The customer service worker wanted to pursue music and the arts, and the insurance worker wanted to work in government service. Importantly, these goals were not random "pipe-dreams." The workers all had previous education or experience in their goal area that might have provided a foundation for pursuit of their professed desires, had they been fully assessed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The gap between life goal and current job was jarringly evident among immigrants and political refugees, as understanding American "careers" was particularly difficult, linguistically and structurally, for families raised in countries outside the U.S. At Jobs Initiative intake and pre-training testing, immigrant participants regularly emphasized that reading, writing or speaking English caused no difficulties. In contrast, case managers emphasized that immigrants' verbal proficiency often obscured the more subtle deficits that ESL-speakers experience: for example, knowledge about how to access social institutions; knowledge of American advancement procedures; and fear about changing employment environments:

> *"Their English. It seems OK, but it's not good enough to do more than at present."*
>
> CBO Case Manager

While career assessment is not easy or straightforward, more intensive vocational assessment and guidance, before and after employment, might be considered for future Jobs Initiative projects and other workforce programs. It will also be important for future research to examine how knowledge about "career" processes, having alternative goals, and wrestling with immigrant status influence advancement over time.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS

Moving Up is a Steep Climb...
Many People's Efforts are Needed to Get There

Using ethnography to study work and family life in the Milwaukee and Seattle Jobs Initiatives illuminated how the Annie E. Casey Foundation's innovative demonstration program helped parents from impoverished urban neighborhoods obtain jobs that helped them be adequate providers, good parents, and community citizens.

Customized skills training, program legitimization, and carefully-crafted partnerships between the Jobs Initiative and employers *together* launched parents into "good jobs" with good wages, benefits, and advancement opportunity for the first time in their lives. Post-employment support from Jobs Initiative projects aided parents' adjustment to challenging new work and family tasks. Children's welfare improved accordingly, either immediately or over time. Most dramatically, children reconciled with absent parents, moved to safer neighborhoods, were more adequately fed and clothed, became more integrated into their communities, had more opportunities for enrichment, and eventually improved their grades and behavior in school. In essence, the Jobs Initiative helped parents begin to compensate for ravaged pasts and provide social and cultural capital for their children's futures.

At the same time, the family narratives reveal the extent of life events, characteristics and needs that Jobs Initiative families confront simultaneously, the length of time it may take to overcome their former and persistent challenges, and the recognition that multiple players are essential to helping families move up. This research also reinforces that "rapid attachment" only is not the solution for most families with employment challenge, be it from years on welfare, years in prison, being a political refugee, not having enough education, or teen or single parenthood. Such families need education and training, hospitable workplace policies and practices, and sustained post-employment support in order to reach the steep and distant goal of family-supporting incomes. These needs are shared by other Jobs Initiative families, and likely by low-income families working outside the Jobs Initiative.

As national attention moves from welfare dependency to the increasingly pervasive plight of low-income workers, new effort can be spent on ways to provide sufficient human, social and cultural capital for parents and for the 'next generation' of workers and community members, their children. Even though the particular kind of disadvantage may differ, families need a multi-pronged effort to overcome it: Effort by the worker, effort by the worker's family, effort by workforce programs like the Jobs Initiative, effort by employers, effort by community institutions, and effort by public policymakers. No single effort is enough by itself.

The conclusions at this point in the 8-year demonstration program, and for this continuing ethnographic research, are that the Jobs Initiative is making important contributions to workforce attachment, retention and advancement; that customized skill training pays initially but more education and training is needed to reach self-sufficiency; and that employers and public policymakers are key players in whether workers in America remain poor or can earn enough money to live and raise their children well.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER 4

PUBLIC POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR PARENTS' WORK AND CHILDREN'S WELFARE[3]

Implications for Income Sufficiency Policies

Make work pay by lengthening and increasing subsidy eligibility

This research found that subsidies and income supplements are as critically important to the income adequacy of low-income workers as they are to the income adequacy of welfare leavers. Short of a sea change in employer wage practices or a thriving national economy, low-income workers in America will need state and federal income assistance for the many years it takes to reach a family-sustaining wage. Many low-income workers phase out of eligibility long before their wages can support family needs, as this research illustrates.

If phase-out eligibility rates for Medicaid, Section 8, childcare, and the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) were dramatically slowed, these income assists could reach the growing cadre of somewhat 'higher' low-income workers and, at the same time, provide richer and longer benefits to those currently eligible. Such assistance might improve both groups' abilities to stay employed. Washington and Wisconsin provide two examples of such expansion. Washington raised the TANF eligibility level from under 175% to 225% of the federal poverty level (FPL) in January 2000. Wisconsin TANF eligibility was set at a liberal 250% FPL at the end of 2001, although eligibility for children's benefits was set at a lower 185%. Larger and more sustained subsidies could improve children's welfare by reducing or eliminating periods of financial insecurity, reducing the need for parents to work overtime, and by increasing disposable family income for capital-building enrichment in the short run and asset development in the long run.

Make work pay by revising the index used to calculate subsidy eligibility

State, local and federal government should revise eligibility standards for low-income programs currently indexed to the federal poverty level, such as food stamps, housing and children's health insurance, in light of self-sufficiency standards such as the one developed by University of Washington Professor Diana Pearce (see Pearce 2000; 2001; Wider Opportunities for Women, 2001). Income, relative to family size, is the only criterion for programs whose eligibility is indexed to the federal poverty level. In contrast, programs indexed to a self-sufficiency standard assess eligibility according to the monthly, local cost of basic needs such as housing, food, childcare, transportation, healthcare, and taxes, in addition to income. Self-sufficiency standards also require differential assessment of family needs according to children's ages. As this research suggests, calculating 'how many' children a family has does not account for differences in the cost of certified childcare or pre-school compared to public school or differences in the cost of feeding an infant compared to a teenager. Use of a national formula based on 'number in family' does not account for significant geographic variation in these costs. By 2001, 14 states used Pearce's Self-Sufficiency Standard for at least some subsidy calculations and by the end of 2002, 35 states will have a standard available for use (Wider Opportunities for Women, 2001).

Workforce development efforts like the Jobs Initiative and its community partners could consider active support for the Self-Sufficiency Act (H.R. 3667) introduced in the House of Representatives on January 29, 2002 by California Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey. Woolsey's bill proposes that all states use self-sufficiency standards (like Pearce's) to measure their success in moving families toward economic self-sufficiency under PRWORA. The bill also proposes

[3]Julie Strawn, senior policy analyst, and Mark Greenberg and Steve Savner, senior staff attorneys, generously contributed policy comments that I have incorporated here. Final interpretations and errors are mine alone.

to hold states accountable for determining what public and programmatic work supports forward the goal of self-sufficiency.

Make work pay by using innovative new practices to maximize subsidy enrollment

As this and other reports have revealed, income assistance subsidies are severely underutilized, due in part to fragmented services and faulty information. In 1999 for example, although 80% of eligible individuals and families in the state of Washington used EITC, a mere 15% of those eligible used childcare, 60% used health insurance, and 55% used food stamp subsidies (City of Seattle, 2001). In systemic workforce efforts like the Jobs Initiative, employers and workforce development partners may be better positioned to inform families about subsidies and supplements and reduce underutilization. Seattle Office of Economic Development's "best practice" proposal, the *Public Benefits Portal* (Johnson, 2001), is one model that employers and programs could use to facilitate and maximize subsidy and supplement use. Johnson's proposal would establish a simple, integrated, electronic enrollment system to inform people about benefit eligibility and allow them to apply on-line at public sites such as libraries, senior centers, and employment offices.

Make work pay by establishing between-job income support

Low-wage workers frequently do not have earnings that are large or sustained enough to meet the Unemployment Insurance (UI) earning base period or workforce connection tests. In addition, parents who leave employment to fulfill family responsibilities are often not UI-eligible (Strawn & Martinson, 2000). Public assistance re-enrollment currently provides between-job income for some new workers, although TANF time limits will likely end this strategy. Moreover, the higher—albeit still insufficient—incomes of other new workers leave them ineligible for TANF.

Given the family demands and job conditions of low-income workers illuminated in this research, workers who are not eligible for TANF or regular UI need an alternative type of unemployment benefit for short periods between jobs (see Greenberg & Savner, 1999 for one example). One-stop centers established under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) are a logical site for an alternative benefit program, as Greenberg and Savner (1999) noted. Whatever the program's form, the eligibility cap for between-job income support should be set high enough to reward attempts to sustain work, fully recognizing that Jobs Initiative jobs, and even more so those attained by welfare leavers, are vulnerable to layoff, harsh physical conditions, and slow wage progression such that job change may be a response. "Reason for unemployment" and specified base periods should be eliminated as eligibility criteria, based on the fact that job pathways of welfare leavers and "work returners," like those in the Jobs Initiative, are often sporadic in the beginning. Eliminating "reason for unemployment" would also accommodate the range of family and workplace reasons for between-job unemployment demonstrated in this research. Periods of coverage could parallel "retention" definitions in workforce programs like the Jobs Initiative and allow automatic coverage for 30 days between jobs. An additional period of coverage could be based on demonstrated—and supported—re-employment efforts that take local employment conditions into consideration.

WIA funding would need to be increased to cover the cost of alternative unemployment benefits and re-employment assistance, but bridge income support could help individuals persist and advance out of the low-wage work market rather than resort to welfare re-enrollment or risk deeper family poverty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Implications for Workplace Policies

This research suggests that if workplace practices officially accommodate workplace and family needs, new workers and supervisors will not be caught in impossible binds that lead the worker to be terminated or quit. In a recent journal issue about time and the employment relationship, Golden (2001) and others called for the development of a national work hours policy that bears serious consideration. Based on experiences of European labor markets, Golden found that a full continuum of time and schedule options at work pays big dividends via improved retention, productivity, and job satisfaction, which parallels this study's findings.

Discovery of the *life-stage mismatch* in this research also suggests that workforce programs and employers need to address physical health and conditioning so that workers and workplaces "match" better. Instruction about ergonomics and physical conditioning should be part of all workforce training. At the same time, the Jobs Initiative and other workforce programs must carefully evaluate the safety and physical conditions of their employer partners. Implications abound for the ways in which workforce development programs could intersect with employers to improve retention and reduce turnover: advocacy for heightened workplace safety; instruction about contemporary parents' life demands, especially those of single-parents; and development of more ways to make skill advancement an integral part of the job position.

Implications for Immigrant and Political Refugee Policies

In this research, the multiple dislocations of immigrant and refugee families and resultant language and cultural issues compounded their hesitancy to change jobs and disrupt the status quo. Current policies exacerbate such hesitation. Home-country educational attainment is not recognized by most institutions and employers. GED attainment is not mandated in refugee centers, community service centers, or workforce programs. Work program staff and employers generally know little about contemporary immigration policy and legislation. At the same time, increasing numbers of immigrants are coming to the United States to work and stay. These disconnects suggest the need for:

1) National examinations and standards for foreign degrees instead of English-based equivalency examinations that penalize those whose English is limited. Equivalency standards, like interstate and international licensing boards, could give immigrants and refugees a fairer chance at adaptation and recognition in their new host country.

2) Increased funding and support for ESL education and GED attainment in refugee camps, community resettlement centers, and workforce programs.

3) Administration of whole family, versus individual, assessments with immigrants and political refugees. The family's particular emigration or refugee experience and language needs are salient to both immediate and future employment actions and possibilities.

Implications for Workforce Development Policies

WIA funding for 2001 was a low $3.64 billion compared to $16.5 billion for TANF and the additional $10 billion in state maintenance of effort funds, $7.6 billion for Pell grants, and the estimated $232 billion that American businesses spend annually on workforce training (Worthen, 2001), largely for high-level employees. Worse yet, only about one-

third of WIA funding ($1 billion) supports workforce development services for adults (Clymer, Roberts, & Strawn, 2001). At the same time, millions of new and returning full-time, full-year workers earn below-poverty incomes and need more education and skills to advance to jobs with family-sustaining incomes (Clymer, Roberts, & Strawn, 2001).

Findings from this research underscore that more rather than less TANF and WIA funds should be allocated to workforce development. Businesses could receive tax breaks for contributing part of their vast training budgets to providers of training services under WIA. Businesses could partner with these providers to craft training curricula and guarantee post-training job opportunities, as modeled by the Jobs Initiative. In the long run, to lift the nation's workers out of poverty, workforce development funding must cover *both* basic and upgrade education.

GED and basic education:

Research has documented the need for a high school diploma or GED as the bare minimum for job attainment and retention, yet basic education courses are often poorly funded, poor quality, and not supported by federal student aid (Strawn, 1998; 2000). This research underscores that despite the best efforts of program and participant, without policy changes lack of a GED is likely to severely curtail long-range wage gains and employment efforts of Jobs Initiative and other workforce program graduates, particularly those who are immigrants. In contrast, more funding for GED education would pay dividends through providing a base for subsequent education and training that could lead to advancement opportunities otherwise out of reach (Strawn, 1998).

At present, programs funded by TANF and WIA minimize training and prioritize employment. Although some states have recently relaxed their restrictions on education, in 2000 the Wisconsin state legislature approved $1 1/2 million for customized training that did not include basic skills education. Restrictions on how much education counts toward satisfying the TANF work requirement should be relaxed further during TANF reauthorization deliberation in 2002—ideally, two years of pre- and post-secondary education should be counted as "work." WIA funding for basic as well as upgrade education should also be increased so that the expanding cadre of low-income workers have a real chance to get employed, stay employed, and eventually "move up."

Post-employment upgrade education and training:

In contrast to single individuals in "traditional" work pathways, economically-disadvantaged workers often have family demands and responsibilities that they put before upgrade activities: essentially, the "*life-stage mismatch*" documented in this research. Program and policy changes could minimize these conflicting goals and improve family well-being.

At the program level, Strawn and Martinson (2000) urged workforce efforts like the Jobs Initiative to negotiate with employers to provide low-wage workers with at least 8 hours per month of release time to participate in on-site work-supporting activities. Release time would eliminate the wrenching "work-family" conflicts experienced by families in this research. In addition, the Jobs Initiative could be used as a "best practice" model to increase targeted post-employment as well as pre-employment training through crafted partnerships between community colleges and local industries and businesses.

At state, local, and federal government levels, funds for workforce development and academic institutions must be expanded so that individuals can pursue upgrade training or college education without placing their families in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

dire economic straits that befell families in this research. Across the nation, states spent less than one percent of the TANF block grant in 2000 on education and training (Savner, Strawn, & Greenberg, 2002: 12). Two far-sighted proposals could be used as models for broader funding and implementation of upgrade training under WIA and TANF.

First, the *Washington State Earned Family Supplement Program (EFS)*, an economic opportunity agenda proposed by Mark McDermott (2001) of the City of Seattle's Office of Economic Development, is designed to help low-wage working parents earn expanded financial aid for post-employment education and upgrade training. Essentially, individuals who have worked at least 5000 hours in the previous 5 years, but whose family incomes are still below 200% of the federal poverty line, would be eligible for a family supplement to the federal financial aid program that would fund up to 6 full-time quarters in community or technical college. Participating parents would be eligible for full-time subsidized childcare through the state childcare program during all school hours and related work-study, internships, or other employer-based training component. The EFS is structured around retaining eligibility for financial aid and other federal subsidy programs (McDermott, 2001:3).

Second, the *Career Ladders Fund*, a research and demonstration project proposed by Steve Savner, Julie Strawn, and Mark Greenberg (2002) of the Center for Law and Social Policy is designed to improve low-wage workers' opportunities for better-quality jobs. Welfare recipients, other low-income families, and noncustodial parents would earn access to Career Training Accounts by sustaining employment for a period of time (Savner, Strawn, & Greenberg, 2002:13). The fund would also provide technical assistance and Career Ladder Grants to states to identify and replicate "best practice" training approaches that help those with lower skills, limited English, and/or other challenges to obtain higher-quality jobs (Savner, Strawn, & Greenberg, 2002:13). Training would be available to non-high school graduates and graduates alike, as was the case in the Jobs Initiative. Certificates or other credentials would be created to maximize training portability, potentially providing the kind of "legitimization" for a "good job" that this research found so effective in the Jobs Initiative.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Research Design

Background: The local economy in Milwaukee and Seattle. During the period of this research, economic conditions in Milwaukee and Seattle were roughly similar. In February 2000, Milwaukee was riding the crest of the nation's economic improvement, yet as early as June 2000, Wisconsin was officially declared a "low-income" state, meaning there were high numbers of vulnerable low-wage workers. By May 2001, Milwaukee experienced substantial economic downturn, especially in the manufacturing industry. Over the same period, Washington rode the crest of the "dot.com" boom. At the same time, the Washington economy was not creating enough living-wage jobs for all those who needed them (Northwest Policy Center, 2001). A few years earlier, 72% of all jobs in the state economy paid less than the requisite living wage for a single adult with two children (Northwest Policy Center, 2001). Essentially, the riches remained at the high end of the economic spectrum, trickling down very little to the low end. Thus, we expected to see increased layoffs among the study workers over the course of the 18 months—and we did. The cities' worsening economies also meant that re-employment was more difficult. Not only was moving up nearly impossible, re-employment often meant taking a wage cut.

Site Description: Milwaukee Jobs Initiative and Seattle Jobs Initiative. Jobs Initiative sites developed differently according to the nature of the city and the auspices and character of the regional intermediary (the central Jobs Initiative organization). [See Abt Associates and New School University, 2000 and Fleischer, 2001 for more detailed descriptions of each city's Jobs Initiative] The Milwaukee and Seattle Jobs Initiatives shared essential components but were also marked by differences. Applicants in both Initiatives received initial assessment and industry orientation, customized skill training, soft skill classes, job placement or referral, and follow-up. Both Initiatives also made some direct job placements without skill training. The research team purposively only examined individuals who participated in skill training to ascertain how families fared with skill training plus extensive follow-up services, as nearly all other programs at the time had eliminated training in favor of immediate work and followed-up for 90 days at most. Some Jobs Initiative enrollees were "guaranteed" jobs upon completion of skill training; in other cases the Initiative helped them find jobs. Hard skill training took place at the partner organization, the employer, or the local vocational institution and included a soft skill component as well. In both sites, employers and other industry representatives designed skill-based curricula in active partnership with the intermediary, the projects and training institutions. In Milwaukee, manufacturing, printing, and construction, and in Seattle, manufacturing, automotive services, and office occupations comprised the primary Jobs Initiative industry sectors and were the placement sites for study participants.

The scale and structure of the two Initiatives differed. The Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI) was an independent intermediary with strong ties to labor and the Center for Wisconsin Strategy (COWS), a research and advocacy center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. MJI projects were similarly independent, free-standing consortia of unions, management, and training facilities that were organized according to industry. These consortia had provided upgrade training for incumbent workers long before the Initiative partnered with them to initiate pre-employment training and placement for the new target population of low-income inner-city residents. Customized pre-employment skill training lasted from one to eight weeks, depending on the sector and union partner, and was reflected in high initial wages for the MJI graduates, extensive benefit packages, and frequent possibility of union membership. MJI's formal post-employment services consisted of connecting new workers with worksite mentors, upgrade train-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ing that was tied to union-management wage progression, and re-employment consultation and referral. Case management was informal, although formal prototypes were being developed at the end of this study.

In contrast, the Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI) intermediary was an official department of the City of Seattle's Office of Economic Opportunity, which led to increased scale from the outset. Located in an office outside the government center, SJI partnered with independent community-based organizations (CBOs) that were either vocational or human service-oriented. The CBOs provided enrollment, referral, placement and follow-up for SJI participants. Case management was the "signature" component of the SJI-CBO partnership, offered intensively by the CBO during training and for one year after employment, and less intensively by the SJI intermediary for a second year. The SJI intermediary also employed brokers and sector managers who consulted regularly with CBOs and employers to develop and refine program elements, develop new industry partnerships, and develop jobs.

Initial wages in Seattle were lower than in Milwaukee, but support services were more extensive. These differences allowed us to examine the relative importance of wages and supports to the job pathways of new or returning workers with backgrounds of labor market and other economic disadvantage. In fact, *both* were critically important to workers and families and *neither* was sufficient alone. Wages were an essential start but not a finish. Case management was both crucial and circumscribed in effect.

Selection of Key Informants. The research design consisted of longitudinal ethnographic study of five families in Milwaukee, five families in Seattle, and multiple auxiliaries per family. The key informants were men and women who had participated in Jobs Initiative training and were employed or in the process of being employed through the Initiative. They were selected purposively as follows: 1) Staff from the Jobs Initiative intermediary and its project affiliates recommended potential informants who completed sector training, were placed or ready to be placed in jobs, and had resident children; 2) I culled this array of about twenty "potentials" per site for varied ages, ethnic backgrounds, education, training and employment sector, amount of time employed, gender, and number of children; 3) After JI staff gained permission, I invited potential informants to participate in the study, aiming for as much demographic variation as possible. Consistent with case design, willingness to participate was the key factor for inclusion in the study (Stake, 1995). Seven invitations in Milwaukee and six in Seattle resulted in the cohorts of five families per city. The ten families remained for the initial study period of 6 to 8 months, February 2000 through October 2000, and for a follow-up period in May-June 2001, roughly eighteen months after study onset. Families were given honoraria for their study participation. The key informants and their family members selected the pseudonyms used in the narratives and overview. I selected pseudonyms for the employers and schools. Jobs Initiative project and community organization names are real [Auxiliary contacts are described in Data Collection section].

Research Team. The field research team consisted of the principal investigator and three on-site researchers in the two cities, all of whom are experienced academic or independent researchers. Several interview protocols were used consistently with all key informants during the study period, particularly at the initial and final interviews. The involvement of multiple interviewers increases the reliability of the data.

Data Collection. The research team gathered both prospective and retrospective data, made possible by the study design. The primary methods of data collection were: 1) In-depth ethnographic interviews with key informants, members of their immediate family, Jobs Initiative intermediary and project staff, employers and co-workers, staff at community organizations, and children's teachers, and 2) Observational shadowing at the key informant's workplace,

children's schools and childcare facilities, and social institutions that played a significant role in the families' lives, such as churches and therapeutic facilities. "Shadowing" also included interviews with personnel at these sites. The data set also included administrative data, organization documents, and statistical data on children's schools. Triangulating the data using multiple sources of evidence increases the validity and potential transferability of the findings (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

The research team interviewed 43 resident family members and over 400 auxiliary persons. The team contacted key informants several times a month and observed and interviewed salient auxiliary contacts twice or more over the study period, resulting in over 1,000 hours of in-person contact. The data set consists of more than 3,000 pages in the form of transcribed audiotapes, field notes, and documents, yielding "massive detailed descriptions" (Becker, 1998) of Jobs Initiative families and their work and family worlds.

CES-D. At initial, 6-month, and 15-month family interviews, I administered the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) to the key informant (Radloff & Locke, 1986). The CES-D is an assessment tool for evaluating individuals' current levels of depressive symptomatology in relation to current levels within the general population. This short, noninvasive tool of 20 questions allowed us to examine the general emotional condition of this group of new workers in relation to employment transitions. The CES-D is used more frequently in recent work and family study, given research findings that depressive symptomatology and clinical depression interfere with coping, job performance, and family welfare, especially in economically disadvantaged families (Lennon, Blome, & English, 2001; Jayakody, Danziger, & Pollack, 1998). I hoped to administer the CES-D to key informants' partners, but was unable to obtain a full set of responses during the initial 6-month study period and discontinued this effort at follow-up. Group CES-D scores at study onset and 15-month follow-up are reported here [See Appendix B]. Findings about depressive symptomatology and the Jobs Initiative are reflected generally in the family narratives and will be reported further in a future publication (Iversen & Armstrong, in progress).

Child well-being. As we considered how to evaluate children's welfare, we recognized that prosocial indicators were limited in large surveys of children, especially those conducted among adolescents (Hauser, Brown & Prosser, 1997). We reviewed formal measures of child well-being, but found them too clinical for the purposes of this study, as have other researchers (Furstenberg, et al., 1999; West, Hauser, & Scanlan, 1998). Accordingly, we culled common indicators of child well-being from child development and poverty literature (Child Trends, 1999; Furstenberg, et al., 1999; Hauser, Brown, & Prosser, 1997; Magura & Moses, 1986; Parcel & Menaghan, 1994; Scheuren & Wang, 1999) for ethnographic attention. These indicators included children's health, behavior at home and at school, school grades, peer interactions, safety measures, community involvement, and housing conditions.

Data Analysis. The "case," or unit of analysis was the key informant, the technical term for the individual selected as the MJI or SJI ethnographic study participant. We organized all interview and observational data around the cases. We conducted analyses throughout the study period, which resulted in our ability to follow-up emergent themes and questions (Becker, 1998; Moffitt, 2000). We coded the ethnographic data using the computerized qualitative program N-Vivo, which yielded broad categories for analysis and further exploration. The core analytic strategy was the use of multiple data sources to develop case descriptions that documented the range and complexity of effects and pathways between living-wage employment and family and community welfare. We called these the "Family Stories." Three researchers analyzed data for each case study: the principal investigator, a graduate research assistant, and the on-site researcher, reducing potential bias. We increased validity through family review of the case study narratives

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Yin, 1994). This step is a recent contribution to qualitative rigor (Duneier, 1999) that also forwards the conceptual premise that families are the primary experts on their lives. Changes resulted through a discussion-and-resolution process. Where disagreement remained, it was identified as such in the narrative.

Use of multiple sources and levels of data as well as multiple researchers and analysts, also called triangulation, increased the reliability of the data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Use of ethnographic interviews and observations as reciprocal influences progressively and developmentally particularized and deepened study findings. Administrative data from Jobs Initiative sites provided environmental background for the family context leading up to and during the period of study. Supplemental use of these data in the analysis ensured methodological triangulation. Quantitative cross-site data from the national evaluation team, Abt Associates, Inc. and New School University (2000), and a synthesis of evaluation and early ethnographic findings (Fleischer, 2001) rounded out the data sources.

Utility of the Findings. Ethnographic research findings are not intended to be generalized in the way of empirical research that uses random samples and control groups. Nevertheless, on any substantive measure, the participants in the ethnographic study sample were similar to other participants in their home Jobs Initiative [See Appendix C]. Thus we can say with considerable confidence that the findings in this monograph pertain to many of the 2300 low-wage workers participating in the Jobs Initiative in Milwaukee and Seattle, extending the utility of the study findings. Because of the rigorous design, study findings may be transferable to other low-income workers as well. Discovering how complex even selected workers' lives were make the study implications even more critical for those in the Jobs Initiative and related workforce development programs who may have more challenged backgrounds and current lives or less sustained pre- and post-employment support. Together with knowledge gained from earlier research, findings from the Jobs Initiative ethnography can advance knowledge about parents' work and children's well-being in ways that can be used to inform the design and content of workforce programs and public policies.

Although the monograph overview periodically compares the ethnographic findings to those from recent welfare-to-work research, the Jobs Initiative population was both similar and different. Many individuals exited welfare through the Jobs Initiative. The most entrenched welfare recipients, however, might not be eligible for all Jobs Initiative projects. More important, welfare research provides information mainly about women. This research provides information about *both* men and women. Still, given limited research addressing the intersection of low-wage work, workforce programs and children, welfare studies offered a body of current, relevant research with which to compare the ethnographic findings.

Workforce program implications were reported to the Milwaukee and Seattle Jobs Initiative sites in separate publications (Iversen, 2001b; 2001c).

Appendix B: Sample Description

Characteristics of the Ethnographic Sample at Study Onset (2/00)**

Characteristics	Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI)	Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI)	Total (MJI+SJI)
Gender	2 female 3 male	3 female 2 male	5 female 5 male
Race/Ethnic Identification	3 African American 1 Latina American 1 African-country origin	1 African American 1 Latina American 1 African-country origin 1-Asian-country origin 1 Latin-country origin	4 African American 2 Latina American 2 African-country origin 1 Asian-country origin 1 Latin-country origin
Age (Range 24-43) Mean: 35 1/2	3 in JI target group 2 older than JI target	2 in JI target group 3 older than JI target	5 in JI target group 5 older than JI target
Marital status at study onset (as categorized at JI intake)	2 Never-married single parents (both had resident partners) 2 Married 1 Unmarried, living w/ partner	1 Never-married single parent (no partner) 3 Married 1 Unmarried, living w/ partners	3 Never-married single parents (2 with, 1 without partner) 5 Married 2 Unmarried, living w/ partners
Partner employment status	3 Employed full time 1 Temp. unemployed 1 Out of labor market	1 Employed full time 1 Temp. unemployed 1 Out of labor market 1 Non-labor market employment-FT	4 Employed full time 2 Temp. unemployed 2 Out of labor market 1 Non-labor market employment-FT
# Months associated with JI (Range 2-20; Mean=13)	1 (1-6 months) 1 (6-12 months) 3 > 12 months	1 (1-6 months) 2 (6-12 months) 2 > 12 months	2 (1-6 months) 3(6-12 months) 5 > 12 months
JI training and employment sector	3 Manufacturing 1 Printing 1 Construction	2 Manufacturing 2 Office 1 Auto	5 Manufacturing 1 Printing 1 Construction 2 Office 1 Auto
# Persons in household (including self)	Range 2-6 Mean = 4.6	Range 2-6 Mean = 4.0	Range 2-6 Mean = 4.3
# Resident children # Non-resident children	Res. Total = 13 Range = 2-3 Mean = 2.6 Non-res. Total = 10	Res. Total = 11 Range = 1-4 Mean = 2.2 Non-res. Total = 4	Res. Total = 24 Range = 1-4 Mean = 2.4 Non-res. Total = 14
TOTAL # CHILDREN	TOTAL = 23	TOTAL = 15	TOTAL = 38
Ages of resident children	1 Infant < 1 year 4 Pre-school < 5 3 Elementary School 2 Middle School 3 High School	1 Infant < 1 year 4 Pre-school < 5 4 Elementary School 2 Middle School	2 Infants < 1 year 8 Pre-school < 5 7 Elementary School 4 Middle School 3 High School

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B: Sample Description (continued)

Characteristics	Milwaukee Jobs Initiative (MJI)	Seattle Jobs Initiative (SJI)	Total (MJI+SJI)
Highest degree (years of school Key Informant completed)	1 GED/HSEquiv (10) 5 H.S. Diplomas (12) 1 B.A. (16) (foreign)	1 GED/HSEquiv (>12) 3 H.S. Diplomas (12) (2 foreign; not recognized in US) 1 No degree	2 GED/HS Equiv 6 H.S. Diplomas 1 College 1 No degree
Primary language (Key Informant)	4 English 1 African Country	2 English 1 African Country 1 Spanish 1 Asian Country	6 English 2 African Country 1 Spanish 1 Asian Country
CES-D Score (KI-Study Onset) Mean Gen. Pop = 9-10	Mean = 9	Mean = 17	JI Mean: 13
**CES-D Score (KI-15-month follow-up)	Mean = 7	Mean = 5	JI Mean = 6
Criminal history/incarc.	3	0	3
Public assistance pre-JI (TANF; Food Stamps; Medicaid)	1	4	5
Public assistance at study onset (KI + family)	1 Medicaid 2 Food Stamps 2 W-2 Childcare subsidy	4 Medicaid 0 Food Stamps 2 Childcare subsidy	5 Medicaid 2 Food Stamps 3 Childcare subsidy
**Public assistance at 15-month follow-up (KI + family)	3 BadgerCare-children 2 W-2 childcare subsidy 5 EITC 4 School lunch subsidy 2 WIC	3 Medicaid (children) 1 Childcare subsidy 4 EITC 1 School lunch subsidy 1 WIC 3 Housing subsidy	6 Medicaid 3 Childcare subsidy 9 EITC 5 school lunch subsidy 3 WIC 3 Housing subsidy
Pre-JI "Disadvantage"— Ongoing (KI):	2 Adult health 3 Debt 1 Stressed partner relationship 3 License problems/no car 1 Language	2 Adult health 2 Debt 1 Stressed partner relationship 3 Language	4-Adult health 5-Debt 2-Stressed partner relationship 3-License problems/no car 4-Language
Over (KI):	1 Former drug use	1 Former drug use	2-Former drug use
JI-period new "Disadvantage" (KI)	2 Workplace injuries & conditions 2 New debt 3 Partner unemployed 2 Transportation/ accidents/uninsured 1 Court demands	2 Workplace injuries & conditions 1 New debt 3 Partner unemployed 1 Transportation/ accidents/uninsured 1 Court demands	4-Workplace injuries & conditions 3 New debt 6-Partner unemployed 3- Transportation/ accidents/uninsured 2-Court demands
Children's chronic health & other problems	2-Asthma 2-Grade retention 1-Breathing problems 1?Learning Disability	2-Developmental delays 2-Allergies 1-Head banging	

**Selected characteristics refer to 15-month follow-up (5/01).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion of Appendix B:
Appendix B shows the demographic characteristics of the MJI and SJI study participants at ethnographic study onset (2/00) and selected characteristics at the 15-month follow-up period (**5/01) using administrative data from MJI/SJI Intake and interview data. "KI" in the "Characteristics" column stands for "Key Informant."

Appendix C. Jobs Initiative Site Comparisons

MJI Ethnographic Study Participants Compared to All Placed MJI Participants in 3 Projects (Construction; Manufacturing; Printing); SJI Ethnographic Study Participants Compared to All Placed SJI Participants; MJI Ethnographic Study Participants Compared to SJI Ethnographic Study Participants. All data pertains to information available at ethnographic study onset (2/00).

Characteristics	MJI: All Placed Participants in 3 Projects (Construction; Manufacturing; Printing) (n = 721)	MJI: Ethnographic Study Sample (n = 5)	SJI: All Placed Participants (n = 1575)	SJI: Ethnographic Study Sample (n = 5)
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Age:				
In target group	60	60	53	40
Other	40	40	47	60
Gender:				
Male	68	60	51	40
Female	32	40	49	60
Difficulty with English				
Yes:	5	20	21	40
No:	95	80	78	60
Public Assistance at Jobs Initiative enrollment				
TANF + Other	52	80	38	80
No	48	20	62	20
Ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	5		21	
Black	82	80	41	40
Hispanic	11	20	9	40
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1		4	
Asian, Pacific Islander, or Filipino	1		21	20
Other	0.4		4	
Family Income at Jobs Initiative enrollment				
< $3000	16	20	30	
$3000-$5,999	16	40	19	40
$6000-$8,999	14	20	17	20
$9000-$11,999	13		12	
$12,000-$14,999	12		8	
$15,000-$19,999	9		8	20
$20,000-$24,999	7		3	20
>$25,000	12	20	2	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C. Jobs Initiative Site Comparisons (continued)

Characteristics	MJI: All Placed Participants in 3 Projects (Construction; Manufacturing; Printing) (n = 721)	MJI: Ethnographic Study Sample (n = 5)	SJI: All Placed Participants (n = 1575)	SJI: Ethnographic Study Sample (n = 5)
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
School/Highest grade completed				
<8	2		3	
8	4		1	
9	5		3	
10	11	20	4	20
11	19		11	20
12	38	60	43	60
13	12		10	
14	8		10	
15	1		3	
46	1	20	9	
17 or over	0		3	
School certification				
No certification			10	20
High School diploma	50	60	48	60
GED	20	20	11	20
Technical certificate	8	(20)	7	
Vocational/Occup Skills	12	(20)	7	(40)
Associates Degree	2		5	
B.A.	0.9	20	7(+1)	
*Average start wage/hr. MJI				
Construction	$13.48	$16.40		
Manufacturing	$9.74	$9.84; 7.86; 11		
Printing	$8.78	$9.76		
Overall Average	$10.67	$10.92		
Average start wage/hr. SJI				
Automotive			$9.07	$8.75
Diversified Manuf.			$8.00	$11.50;***
Office Occupations			$10.14	$11; 11.54
Overall Average			$9.07	$10.70
**Aver. wage/hr. 2-00 MJI				
Construction	$13.29	$16.40		
Manufacturing	$10.16	$10.01; 9.71; 13		
Printing	$8.86	$10.61		
Overall Average	$10.77	$11.95		
Aver. wage/hr. 2-00 SJI				
Automotive			$9.07	$8.75
Diversified/General Manuf.			$9.65;$8.83	$12.43;10.70 (not SJI-job)
General				
Office Occupations			$9.49	$11.53; 11
Overall Average			$9.27	$10.88

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Source: Milwaukee Jobs Initiative Interim Progress Report: Indicators of Progress Report #5b (Cumulative) by Project (2-16-00) and MJI Quick Progress Summary (cumulative wage statistics) by Project (1-10-00; Seattle Jobs Initiative Indicators of Progress Report #5b (Cumulative "Characteristics of Placed Participants" 2-00) and Cumulative "Placement, Wages, and Benefits Report" 2-00) representing data from 9/96 through 12/99.

* The "Average start wage/hr" category represents initial wage at the time of placement, which occurred anywhere from a few months to almost 2 years before ethnographic study onset [See Appendix D].

**The "Average wage/hr 2-00" category represents wage levels at the onset of this research in February 2000.

***The second SJI study participant in the manufacturing sector remained at a non-SJI job that he began in 1991, thus his starting wage has been omitted here.

Discussion of Appendix C:

The fact that the ethnographic study participants were selected, in part, according to the fact that they were known to MJI and SJI staff suggests that these individuals might be "model" examples. We used contingency table analysis (Chi-square) to assess this possibility and compared:

1) MJI ethnographic study participants in the 3 relevant industry sectors compared to all MJI participants placed in those sectors;

2) SJI ethnographic study participants compared to all placed SJI participants;

3) MJI ethnographic study sample compared to SJI ethnographic study sample.

We do not report here on the comparison between MJI and SJI participants as a whole [see Abt Associates and New School, 2000; Fleischer, 2001], as our interest is in how each study sample compares to its city's Initiative and how the two cities' study participants compare with each other. There were a few statistically significant differences at the .05 level or less between characteristics of MJI and SJI participants as a whole, but they were not substantive differences [details available from author].

Each city's ethnographic study sample was remarkably similar to the full set of participants in its home Initiative. Moreover, with one exception there were no significant differences between MJI and SJI ethnographic study participants on the set of characteristics. Because one MJI study participant completed college, schooling of MJI compared to SJI ethnographic study participants was different. But similar to education level in the Initiatives as a whole, MJI and SJI study participants generally had 12 years of education.

Appendix D: Job and Wage Progression Charts

Chart D-1. MJI Employment Pathways: Pre- and Post-MJI (February 2000 through May 2001)

Participant	"Challenges" (Pre-MJI and in some cases ongoing)	Pre-JI Employment & Wage (Pot.Ann.Inc)	MJI training: Project/Date	MJI Job #1 & Wage (Est.Ann.Inc)
Tasha Jones	Low-wage jobs Health & children's health @$5000 debt	$ 7.60/hr 32-hour wk ($12,600)	Manufact. Project 7/99-8/99	8/99-3/00 Manuf. Co. $9.84→$10.01/hr ($20,000)→ ($16,650) Term.
Kevin McDonalds	Felony incarceration Low-wage jobs/ Frozen out of good jobs/ 3 kids $9000 IRS debt (4/01) Children school problems	$6.50/hr ($13,500)	Printing Project 2/99-4/99	4/99-9/99 Bindery $9.76/hr ($20,300)
Randy Jackson	Immigrant Under-employed Sole wage-earner	$13.50/50-hr week ($28,000)	Construction Project 1/2000	1/00-2/01 Construction Co. $16.40 hr→ $19/hr. ($32,800→ $39,520)
Tisha Shanks	Felony incarceration Low-wage jobs Single parent/3 ch. $5700 debt→$900 plus $3100 new utilities debt	$6.25/hr ($13,000)	Manufact. Project 9/98	9/98-8/00 Product Manuf. Co. $7.86/hr→ $9.71/hr ($16,350→ $19, 420)
Hard Working Blessed	Felony incarceration Substance abuse Low-wage jobs/ under-employed $20,000 debt	$6.50/hr ($13,500)	Manufact. Project 5/98	6/98-4/00 Steel Mill & Foundry $11/hr→$13/hr ($23,900→ $27,000)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MJI or non-MJI Job #2 & Wage (Est.Ann.Inc)	Job #3 & Wage (Est.Ann.Inc)	100% FPL* 200% FPL* Self-Suffic. Standard**	Participant
2 mo. TANF 1 day School Dietician @ min. wage	(MJI→) 5/00 – 12/00 Distrib. Co. $9.66→$10. 36/ hr + 8 without OT (pot.$28,200) [$21,548 without OT]	$14,150 $28,300 $20.12/hr $24,220/yr per adult	**Tasha Jones**
(MJI→) 9/99 Printing & Bindery $9.76/hr→prom →$10.61/hr +OT ($28,700) 10/00→ $12.09/hr +OT ($32,150) [$25,150 without OT]		$17,050 $34,100 $15.51/hr $31,020/yr per adult	**Kevin McDonalds**
2/01 FFF Construction $21.10/hr ($43,900)		$17,050 $34,100 $12.11/hr $24,220/yr per adult	**Randy Jackson**
8/00-5/01 Steel Co. $10.93/hr + OT → ($28,500) $12.50/hr+OT (5/01) ($30,600) [$27,734 without OT]		$19,950 $39,900 $15.81/hr $32,900/yr per adult	**Tisha Shanks**
5/00-8/00 Printing Co. $10.20/hr→$11/hr+OT (@$23,000) [$22,000 without OT]	8/00—- Metal Co. $11/hr→$13/hr+3OT (@$30,000)	$19,950 $39,900 $15.81/hr $32,900/yr per adult	**Hard Working Blessed**

*FPL = Federal Poverty Level. Calculated according to guidelines set 2/2000. Federal poverty guidelines are set according to Number of family members—e.g. Family of 3; Family of 4. Income figures for FPL are for MJI participant only.

**Self-Sufficiency Standard for Wisconsin (Pearce, 2000). Calculated according to 1999 figures in Milwaukee, WI. Self-Sufficiency standard guidelines are calculated according to number of adults, infants, and school-age children in family, local costs, subsidy potential, and two family wage-earners.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chart D-2. SJI Employment Pathways: Pre- and Post-SJI (February 2000 through May 2001)

Participant	"Challenges" (Pre-SJI and in some cases ongoing)	Pre-JI Employment & Wage (Pot.Ann.Inc)	SJI training: Project/Date
Maya Vanderhand	Lack of h.s. diploma or GED Immigrant	$8.00/hr (20/hr week) ($8000)	Office Occupations 9/98-12/98
Teresa Russell	Single parent/ sole wage earner Long history of short-term, low-wage jobs. 2000: Close to 1 missed workday/ week (minus-$3000 income)	TANF + occasional catering ($4500 + $1500) $7/hour (most recent job)	Automotive 9/99-12/99
Mike Jeremy	Immigrant/Political refugee Under-employed Sole wage-earner Serious health problems (some job-induced)	$8.25/hr ($17,900)	Diversified Manufacturing/CNC 10/98-1/99
Isabell Smith	Childhood abuse Former heroin addiction Health problems Developmentally delayed children $7000 debt	TANF ($3000-$6000)	Office Occupations 6/99-9/99 5/01 Web Design (permanently laid off Dot-Com 5/01)
Lucky Miracle	Immigrant/Political refugee—multiple relocations Limited English Severe "under-employment"	6/91→ $5.50→ $10.70 (pre-SJI)	Diversified Manufacturing/ General 9/99-12/99

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SJI Job #1 & Wage (Est.Ann.Inc)	SJI or non-SJI Job #2 & Wage (Est.Ann.Inc)	100% FPL* 200% FPL* Self-Suffic. Standard**	Participant
1/99→ Insurance Co. Est. $11.53/hr ($24,000)→ Est. $12.40/hr ($25,800)		$22,850 $45,700 $12.22/hr. per adult $51,630/yr	Maya Vanderhand
1/00→ Rental Car Co. $8.75/hr (30-hr week 9 mo; 40-hr 3 mo) ($14,700) →$9/hr 10/00 (pot. $15,100) +$1500/yr catering → $9.50/hr 5/01 (pot. $19,760) + $1500/yr cater		$11,250 $22,500 $12/hr. per adult $23,352/yr	Teresa Russell
1/99-4/00 Equipment Manufacturer $11.82/hr (temp) 3/99 (perm) $11.50/hr → $12.43/hr ($25,850)	4/00→ (Non-SJI) Parking Company $8.50/hr; no benefits; 30 hour/wk ($13,300) (10/00 40hr/wk; sometimes $9.50/hr) ($18,700) 5/01 $9.75/hr (pot. $20,300)	$17,050 $34,100 $10.57/hr. per adult $44,638/yr	Mike Jeremy
10/99→ Dot-Com Company Trainee ($10/hr) Permanent ($11/hr) ($22,800 + OT → $25,800) → $12/hr 7/00 ($24,960—no OT) → $13/hr 5-01 ($27,040)		$17,050 $34,100 $10.57/hr. per adult $44,638/yr	Isabell Smith
6/91→ continued at Food Company (Non-SJI job) $10.70/hr + OT ($24,000) 5/01 30-hr/wk ($16,700)	9/00→ Second job (Non-SJI) School Custodian $14.62/hr ($30,400) 5/01 40-hr/wk ($30,400)	$17,050 $34,100 $11.43/hr. per adult $43,276/yr	Lucky Miracle

* FPL = Federal Poverty Level. Calculated according to federal poverty guidelines set 2/2000. FPL guidelines are set according to number of family members—e.g. Family of 3; Family of 4. Income figures for FPL are for SJI participant only.

**Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington (Pearce, 2001). Calculated according to 2000 figures in Seattle, WA. Self-Sufficiency Standard guidelines are calculated according to number of adults, infants, and school-age children in family, variation in local costs, subsidy potential, and two family wage-earners (except for the single-parent family).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion of Appendix D: (See also monograph overview text)
Because the families had entered the Jobs Initiative at different times before the research period, we calculated their average wage increases according to the different amounts of time they had been employed. The 'rule of thumb' is that each $1 increase in hourly wage results in an increase of $2000 in annual income.

Three family heads' wages grew by $1 or slightly over $1/hour per year, which meant that their average incomes grew $2000 yearly for at least two years of employment.

Two family heads' wages grew significantly more than $1/hour per year: one grew $3.13 and the other $2.61, accounting for average annual increases of over $6000 and $5000 respectively. Because both increases were a result of recent job changes, they were *potential* not actual annual increases. Moreover, the positive effects of one increase were reduced by the fact that it was the sole family income and the positive effects of the other were muted by it being a second job.

In contrast, four family heads' wages increased less than $1/hour per year, resulting in annual increases of $666 (2), $1000 (1), and $1332 (1) for one to 3 years of employment.

The final family head's wages decreased $1332 over 2 1/2 years of employment due to a job change that resulted in a severe downgrade.

REFERENCES
(Monograph Overview and Family Stories)

Aberg, L. (2001, May 26). A fresh start. *Federal Way Mirror*, pp. A12, 13.

Abt Associates and New School University. (2000). *AECF Jobs Initiative: Evaluation report on the capacity building phase (March 1997-March 2000); Cross-site report* (draft). Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Annie E. Casey Foundation (2000). *Stronger links: New ways to connect low-skilled workers to better jobs*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Armour, S. (2001, June 25). Telecommuting gets stuck in the slow lane. *USA Today*, pp. A1, 2.

Bartik, T.J. (2001). *Jobs for the poor: Can labor demand policies help?* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Becker, H.S. (1998). *Tricks of the trade*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Cameron, S., & Heckman, J. (1993). The non-equivalence of high school equivalents. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 11, 1-47.

Cao, J., Stromsdorfer, E.W., & Weeks, G. (1996). The human capital effect of General Education Development certificates on low income women. *Journal of Human Resources*, 31, 206-228.

Carnevale, A.P. & Desrochers, D.M. (1999). *Getting down to business*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Child Trends. (1999). *Children and welfare reform: A guide to evaluating the effects of state welfare reform policies*. Washington, DC: Author.

City Kids Count, 2000. (2001). Data on the well-being of children in large cities. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Available: http://www.aecf.org/kidscount/city.

City of Seattle. (2001). Seattle Mayor's Paul Schell's Help for Working Families Initiative: Background Paper. Seattle: Office of Economic Development, City of Seattle.

Clymer, C., Roberts, B. & Strawn, J. (2001). *States of change*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Copeland, P.Y. (2000, May 28). Here's your homework, parents. *Milwaukee Sentinel Journal*, J-1.

Corcoran, M. (2000). Mobility, persistence, and the intergenerational determinants of children's success. *Focus*, 21, No. 2, 16-20.

Dion, R. & Pavetti, L. (2000). Access to and participation in Medicaid and the Food Stamp program: A review of the recent literature. Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Dodson, L. (1999). *Don't call us out of name*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Duneier, M. (1999). *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Edin, K. & Lein, L. (1997). *Making ends meet*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Fleischer, W. (2001). *Extending ladders: Findings from the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative*. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Foster, D. (2001, March 24). With Boeing's exit, Seattle takes another hit. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, pp. B1, 6.

Freedman, S., et al. (2000). *National evaluation of Welfare-to-Work strategies*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Friedlander, D. & Burtless, G. (1995). *Five years after: The long-term effects of welfare-to-work programs*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Furstenberg, F.F. Jr., Cook, T.D., Eccles, J., Elder, G.H. Jr., & Sameroff, A. (1999). *Managing to make it*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Galvin, K. (2000, November 17). Labor targets Amazon.com. *Seattle Times*, http://archives.seattletime.

Gerstel, N. & Clawson, D. (2001). Union's responses to family concerns. *Social Problems*, 48, 277-297.

Gewirtz, S. (2001). Retaining low-income residents in the workforce: Lessons from the Annie E. Casey Jobs Initiative. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Also http://www.aecf.org/jobsinitiative.

Giloth, B. & Gewirtz, S. (1999). Retaining low-income residents in the workforce. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Also http://www.aecf.org/jobsinitiative.

Giloth, R. & Phillips, W. (2000). Getting results: Outcome management and the Annie E. Casey Foundation Jobs Initiative. Research brief. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Glander, L. (1999). *The WRTP mentor training guide*. Milwaukee, WI: Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (WRTP).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Golden, L. (2001). Flexible work schedules: Which workers get them? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 1157-1178.

Greenberg, M. (2001). Testimony—House Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Greenberg, M. & Savner, S. (1998). Creating a workforce development structure for all working-age adults. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Hamilton, G., Freedman, S. & McGroder, S.M. (2000). *Do mandatory welfare-to-work programs affect the well-being of children?* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Hamilton, G., Freedman, S., Gennetian, L., Michalopoulos, C., Walter, J, Adams-Ciardullo, D., Gassman-Pines, A., McGroder, S., Zaslow, M., Ahluwalia, S., and Brooks, J. (2001, November). *How effective are different welfare-to-work approaches? Five-year adult and child impacts for eleven programs*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Hansell, S. (2001). "Dot-Com", facing slowdown, cuts 1,300 jobs. *The New York Times*, pp. C1, 11.

Harrison, B. & Weiss, M. (1998). *Workforce development networks*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hauser, R.M., Brown, B., & Prosser, W.R. (Eds.). (1997). *Indicators of children's well-being*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Herr, T. & Halpern, R. (1994). Lessons from Project Match for welfare reform. Chicago: Erikson Institute.

Iversen, R.R. (2000). TANF policy implementation: The invisible barrier. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 27, 139-159.

Iversen, R.R. (2001a). Welfare reform, reproductive reform, or work reform? In J. Barnett (Ed.). *Planning for the New Century*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Iversen, R.R. (2001b). "Without a start, there's no finish." Ethnographic Project #1: Report to Milwaukee Jobs Initiative and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, May 3, 2001.

Iversen, R.R. (2001c). Multiple partners, multiple pathways, multiple outcomes. Ethnographic Project #1: Report to Seattle Jobs Initiative and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, May 24, 2001.

Iversen, R.R. & Armstrong, A.L. (in progress). *Stuck in motion* (working title).

Jargowsky, P.A. (1997). *Poverty and place*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jayakody, R., Danziger, S., & Pollack, H. (1998). Welfare reform, substance abuse and mental health. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management.

Johnson, S. H. (2001). *Public Benefits Portal*. Seattle: Office of Economic Development, City of Seattle.

Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between two nations: The political predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Kadaba, L.S. (2001, February 11). Younger PC users feeling stress injuries. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, pp. A1, 22).

King, E. & Elliot, M. (2000). *Relative strength: A report on the family's place in workforce development initiatives*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Lennon, M.C., Blome, J., & English, K. (2001). Depression and low-income women: Challenges for TANF and welfare-to-work policies and programs. New York: Columbia University, Mailman School of Public Health, National Center for Children in Poverty.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Streeet-level bureaucrats. Dilemmas of the individual and public service*. New York: Russell Sage.

Magura, S. & Moses, B.S. (1986). *Outcome measures for child welfare services*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*, 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, R. (2001). Industrial relations and inmate labor. *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, pp. 339-348.

Martel, J.L. & Langdon, D.S. (2001). The job market in 2000: Slowing down as the year ended. *Monthly Labor Review*, 124 (2), 3-30.

McDermott, M. (2001). Helping working parents earn a brighter future: Creating a state Earned Family Supplement for financial aid. Policy draft, August 31. Seattle: Office of Economic Development.

Michalopoulos, C. (2001). Sustained employment and earnings growth: New experimental evidence on financial work incentives and pre-employment services. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Milwaukee Jobs Initiative Interim Progress Report: Indicators of Progress Report #5b (Cumulative) by Project (2-16-00). Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Jobs Initiative.

Milwaukee Public Schools. (2000). *1998-99 school year report to parents and the community.* Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Public Schools Division of Research and Assessment.

MJI Quick Progress Summary (cumulative wage statistics) by Project (1-10-00). Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Jobs Initiative.

Moffitt, R. (2000). Perspectives on the qualitative-quantitative divide. *Poverty Research News*, 4(1), 5-8.

Morris, P., Duncan, G.J., & Chase-Lansdale, L. (2001). Welfare reform's effects on children. *Poverty Research News*, 5, 5-9.

Morris, P.A., Huston, A.C., Duncan, G.J., Crosby, D.A., & Bos, J.M. (2001). *How welfare and work policies affect children:: A synthesis of research.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Nafziger, R. (2000). The new economy and the future of work. Olympia, WA: Governor's Executive Policy Office.

National Center for Children in Poverty. 2001, June. Child poverty fact sheet. New York: Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health of Columbia University. Available: http://cpmcnet.columbia.edu.

Newman, K. S. (1999). *No shame in my game.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Nightingale, D.S. & Mikelson, K.S. (2000). *An Overview of Research Related to Wisconsin Works (W-2).* Washington, DC: Washington, DC.

Northwest Policy Center. (2001). *Northwest Job Gap Report: Searching for work that pays.* Seattle, WA: Author.

Oliver, P.E. (2001). Racial disparities in imprisonment: Some basic information. *Focus*, 21 (3), 28-31.

Parcel, T.L. & Menaghan, E.G. (1994). *Parents' jobs and children's lives.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Parker, E. & Nichols, J. (2001). Plenary: Casey Jobs Initiative site showcase presentations. Lessons sites have learned: Part I. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative Showcase Conference, September 6-8, 2001.

Pearce, D. (2000). *The Self-Sufficiency Standard for Wisconsin.* Madison, WI: Education Fund of the Wisconsin Women's Network.

Pearce, D. (2001). Personal communication about *the Self-Sufficiency Standard for Washington* (forthcoming), May 25 and June 28.

Radloff, L.S. & Locke, B.Z. (1986). The Community Mental Health Assessment Survey and the CES-D scale. In M.M. Weissman, J.K. Myer, and C.E. Ross, (Eds.), *Community surveys of psychiatric disorders*, pp. 177-189. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rangarajan, A. & Novak, T. (1999). *The struggle to sustain employment: The effectiveness of the Postemployment Services Demonstration.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Rangarajan, A., Meckstroth, A. & Novak, T. (1998). *The effectiveness of the Postemeployment Services Demonstration: Preliminary Findings.* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Savner, S., Strawn, J., & Greenberg, M. (2002). TANF reauthorization: Opportunities to reduce poverty by improving employment outcomes. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Scheuren, F. & Wang, K. (1999). The National Survey of America's Families (NSAF): A mid-term status report. In *Child well-being under welfare reform.* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Seattle Jobs Initiative. (1999). *Revised Strategic Investment Plan.* Seattle, WA: Seattle Jobs Initiative & Office of Economic Development, City of Seattle.

Seattle Jobs Initiative. (2000). *Indicators of Progress Report #5b.* Seattle, WA: Author.

Seattle Public Schools. (1999). Data profile: District summary: Student Information Office [On-line]. Available: www.seattleschools.org/area/siso/disprof/disprof.xml.

Shirk, M., Bennett, N.G., & Aber, J.L. (1999). *Lives on the line.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Simpson, P.A. & Kaminski, M. (2001). Unionists' reactions to rising inequality: The relationship between microjustice and macrojustice revisited. *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, pp. 75-85.

Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

St. George, A., Bonjorni, J., Epstein, B., & Hebert, S. (2001). *Employment placement and retention in the Annie E. Casey Foundation Jobs Initiative.* Boston, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Strawn, J. (1998). Beyond job search or basic education: Rethinking the role of skills in welfare reform. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Strawn, J. (2000). Workforce development for the unemployed and low wage workers: The role of postsecondary education (Working paper). Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Strawn, J. & Martinson, K. (2000). *Steady work and better jobs.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

West, K.K., Hauser, R.B., & Scanlan, T.M. (Eds.). (1998). *Longitudinal surveys of children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Western, B. (2001). Incarceration, unemployment, and inequality. *Focus*, 21 (3), 32-36.

Wever, K., Berg, P. & Kochan, T. (1994). The role of labor market institutions in employee training: Comparing the United States and Germany. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Wider Opportunities for Women. (2001). The Self-Sufficiency Standard. http://www.sixstrategies.org/states.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Wilson, W.J. (1996). *When work disappears*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Worthen, H.H. (2001). WIA in Chicago: Constraints on access enable a "work-first" system. *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, pp. 67-74.

Wysen, K. & Curtis, D. (2001). A coordination challenge for states: A snapshot of major federal programs for children. Portland, ME: National Academy for State Health Policy.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zaslow, M.J., McGroder, S.M., & Moore, K.A. (2000). *Impacts on young children and their families two years after enrollment: Findings from the Child Outcomes Study*. The National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street • Baltimore, MD 21202
410-547-6600 • fax: 410-547-6624
www.aecf.org

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").